

February 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2509

moment appears to be without solution—can be brought to successful conclusion.

Meanwhile, this country has 200,000 men in Vietnam, and thousands more may be sent. Until this war can be successfully concluded, support of these men must have top priority.

I end with this thought: if our scientists can fathom the secret of the atom—if they can send men whirling in space around the world at 17,000 miles an hour—if they can create a spacecraft that will go a quarter of a million miles to the moon—I submit the statesmen should be able to devise an effective formula for world peace.

In other words, I hope that those in my field of endeavor can do as good a job for mankind as you in your profession have done.

RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to presidential succession and inability.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND INABILITY

Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States of America, at the 1st session begun and held at the city of Washington, on Wednesday, the 6th day of January 1965 by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"Sec. 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"Sec. 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"Sec. 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide,

transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit without four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office"; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of state of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, and each Senator and Representative from Maine in the Congress of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution."

In senate chamber.

EDWIN H. PERT,
Secretary.

House of representatives.
JEROME G. PLANTE,
Cleric.

DEATH OF LOUIS C. GERRY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a great public figure has passed from the Rhode Island scene with the death of Louis C. Gerry, financier, business executive, philanthropist, humanitarian whose devotion to public service included a 20-year presidency of Rhode Island Hospital.

He was Red Cross chairman, Community Chest leader, trustee of Brown University, a public official at request of Governor after Governor, for which service he declined remuneration.

From State and city and citizens and schools he was the recipient of honor after honor for his outstanding contributions to the well-being of Rhode Island's people.

All these honors belie the modesty of the man—for Louis Gerry was a gentle, genial, generous friend to every good cause that engaged the community.

It was not the length of his life of 81 years as much as the depth of his living that called him to be so important a part of government, of education, of health, of humanity. He truly gave his

heart to his fellow man the while the wisdom of his mind enhanced the good fortune of our State.

An editorial from the Providence Journal of February 8 portrays the significance of Louis Gerry and his influence on his times—and I ask unanimous consent that it be made part of my tribute to this outstanding American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LOUIS C. GERRY: HIS ACHIEVEMENTS SPEAK FOR HIM

Louis C. Gerry was by nature a man who felt uncomfortable in the presence of attempts to praise him for outstanding services in behalf of the community. He preferred that achievements to which he had contributed should speak for themselves in the good they bestowed, in healthier people, higher standards of living and an increased sense of community responsibility.

Himself, a successful financier and corporation executive, he translated into the field of private beneficence a passion for efficiency and a hatred of waste. He was a hard-headed pragmatist in whatever task engaged his undoubted capacities. When he accepted an assignment of community character, he applied to it the same realistic attention he gave to his private affairs. He never contented himself with part-time or nominal service in a public cause he thought worthy.

As president of the Rhode Island Hospital, he was in charge of an expansion program which replaced a venerable and outmoded plant with a completely modern hospital. From the moment the new hospital was conceived, in a study of plans, to the day it was dedicated formally to the welfare of the community, Mr. Gerry never took his eyes from the work in hand. He watched brick laid upon brick; he brought sound judgment to bear upon the outfitting of the complex equipment of a hospital; he assumed leadership in the financing of the project; he insisted that business principles guide its construction and operation. It is not an exaggeration to say that he worked harder in raising this splendid up-to-date hospital than he did on his private affairs. In semi-retirement, he then gave full time to the management of the hospital. His name belongs high on the list of benefactors in the long history of the Rhode Island Hospital.

Similarly, as chairman of the Providence Chapter of the American Red Cross, president of the Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in community chests activities and as a trustee of Brown, he gave honest, intelligent and true attention to these affairs.

On the surface, Mr. Gerry was a placid and soft-spoken man. His friends would have to think hard to recall a time when he was ruffled or showed a disturbed exterior. Beneath this pleasant manner was a mind that was razor-sharp in cutting through to the heart of problems, making sound decisions and throwing away nonessentials. Inside, he was a volcano of constructive energy that could not temporize with half-measures or sloppy performances.

In the death of Louis C. Gerry, the community has lost a useful citizen who left a heritage of public service in its highest sense.

ILLINOIS STUDY SHOWS SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM ESSENTIAL TO INCREASED MILK CONSUMPTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all the studies that have come to my attention over the past 3 years on the impact of the special milk program for children

February 8, 1966

job.) Laying his glasses aside, to help the situation, he finished out his work with a feeling of satisfaction.

As they began to gather their paraphernalia together to return home, Mr. Tweel bent over to pick up his glasses and found them crushed by a poorly placed shoe heel.

Fortunately, Dr. Farnsworth was driving. The tired, tried and hungry two (Tweel with also a no-glasses headache) stopped in Gallopis for supper. As usual, when he went into the washroom to wash his hands, he took great care to prevent water from ruining his watch, so he laid it atop the towel dispenser.

When they finished their meal, Tweel started to check the time but found a bare wrist. By the time he got back to the washroom the watch was gone.

Wearily and disgusted, but not undaunted, the two came on to Huntington where Dr. Farnsworth let his partner out at Nick's News to do a bit of office work. As was his custom, Tweel unlocked his desk drawer and left the key in the lock, as he only planned to be there a few minutes. Concentrating on the figures before him, he reached over to a side cabinet for something and broke the key off in the lock.

He calmly sat down, called his wife, and waited for her to come and take him home, at last.

Special Report on Vietnam UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last November I made a special report on Vietnam to my constituents. Much of the material in it still has application. I have asked that it be reproduced below:

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By Congressman CRAIG HOSMER)

"Vietniks" demand we get out of Vietnam. Mothers wonder why their sons are sent there. The President wants to negotiate. Military leaders want a victory. Most Americans believe we should see it through. There are many questions about the war.

What is the country like? Half the size, but similar in shape, population, and coastline to California. It's rugged—mostly thick tropical forests, dense mangrove swamps, and concealing rice paddies. Vietnam is more a collection of small villages and hamlets than a strong nation to which the people give allegiance as we do to our country. The people are very poor. Until recently their only contacts with their government were visits from the tax collector with no benefits in return. Along with Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam, South Vietnam was created from French Indochina after France's 1953 defeat at Dienbienphu.

Who are the Vietcong? The Vietcong are strong Communist forces seeking to seize south as ripe for takeover by this means. tion strategy used successfully in Cuba. Following 1953, the North Vietnamese Communist dictatorship of Ho Chi Minh saw the south as ripe for takeover by this means. The war now is in its 12th year. Red China, just to the north, encourages the aggression by supplying great amounts of munitions.

How do the VC fight war of liberation? Strictly according to Communist doctrine. Cadres of VC political organizers and disciplined military units infiltrated South Vietnam. Glittering Red promises of a better life recruited thousands of South Vietnamese into VC ranks. Where promises

failed, threats were used. Systematic terrorism began. Village chiefs, schoolteachers and officials were murdered wholesale. Kill-and-hide guerrilla tactics—so effective in Vietnam's concealing terrain—were used by VC military units to capture much of the country. Final victory was to be capped by consolidating guerrilla bands back into regular military regiments for the last battles.

Why haven't the VC won? For two reasons: First, millions of South Vietnamese would rather be dead than Red. They've fought back desperately and valiantly. Second, the United States has helped them fight. To begin with, by supplies and military "advisers" and now directly with over 160,000 men and more coming every day. Early this summer the tide of battle began to change. Now it's the VC who suffer setbacks.

Why is the United States fighting? For at least three strong reasons: (1) Born in freedom, our country cares for the freedom of others. (2) Should South Vietnam fall, so will Laos and Cambodia—then Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, and Indonesia. Ultimately all of Asia—the Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Japan, and New Guinea—could pass behind the Bamboo Curtain. We fought World War II to keep the Far East from domination by a single, determined aggressor who would force our first line of defense back to the Pacific Coast. We fight in Vietnam for the same reason. (3) Castro got away with his war of liberation. If we don't defeat this one, the Communists surely will start more of them all over Latin America, Africa and elsewhere in the world. U.S. troubles will be endless.

What we are doing in Vietnam is morally right, militarily sound and geopolitically correct.

How do U.S. forces fight? At sea Navy Task Force 77's carrier aircraft share with the U.S. Air Force an around-the-clock harassment of North Vietnam, bombing and strafing anything that moves on roads, rails, or trails. In South Vietnam they blitz suspected Vietcong concentrations. They are on immediate radio call to aid friendly units engaged on the ground. The Navy also hunts and sinks Vietcong shipping in South Vietnam's inland waterways and along the coastline. Its guns fire at enemy units ashore. A U.S. naval officer assists the captain of each Vietnamese Navy ship.

On land the Vietcong enemy wears no uniform and assumes many disguises. He may be anywhere—a laborer or farmer by day, a guerrilla at night. There are no frontlines. One is seldom out of range of the fighting anywhere in South Vietnam. The U.S. Army and Marines fight independently and in cooperation with Vietnamese forces to search out and destroy the enemy. Often the Vietcong cannot be identified until he fires at you.

How is U.S. morale in Vietnam? It's tops—ashore, afloat, and in the air. A fighting day may last 16 to 20 hours—our men are glad to take it. They know their job and its importance. They want to win and are determined to do so. I talked with many wounded in field hospitals. They want to recover quickly and get back to their fighting units. They feel the demonstrators at home stab them in the back as they face the enemy and are as hostile to them as to the Vietcong.

Do planners in Washington try too much to run the war? Most probably. The volume of instructions to generals and admirals on the spot is tremendous. They know as much about fighting this kind of war without letting it get out of hand as Washington does. They know the circumstances at hand much better. It would seem wiser to give them more authority while still reserving top policy decisions to the Pentagon.

What would happen if we pulled out of Vietnam? Our resolve and action is the keystone of free world resistance to Communist aggression all over the world. Pull out that

keystone and everything collapses. Red China and the U.S.S.R. get a green light to take over most of the world.

Why not declare war, bomb Hanoi, blockade the north, etc.? Wisdom of these actions must be kept under constant review. For the present we do a good job destroying supplies from Red China and reinforcements from North Vietnam. Also, supplies from the U.S.S.R. and other bloc countries are coming in less quantity than might be expected. Should we escalate in North Vietnam, it would give Ho Chi Minh cause to call on his allies for more effective help. Thus, there are two sides to the coin when contemplating these possible actions. We want the best one up.

Should we use atomic weapons? In my judgment this amount of force is not needed against targets in North Vietnam and the location of friendly forces and people in South Vietnam is too close for their safe use.

How about using 'nonlethal' gases? These agents, such as tear gas and nausea gas, could be used very effectively. Example: clean out enemy caves and tunnels with nonlethal gas instead of lethal explosives. A lot of killing could be avoided and the work of our forces made easier. The gas here suggested for use does not kill and does not leave lasting aftereffects. It is unlike World War I's deadly gases which created so much horror.

Do we fight cold war along with the hot? Indeed we do. Realizing this is the key to understanding why military victory over the VC is only part of the job in Vietnam. To win final victory and get out we must create a strong nation there—stable and able to take care of itself militarily and in other ways. This means convincing the people that Communist promises are hollow—that the better life comes from their own free government and alliance with the United States.

How do we fight cold war? In addition to fighting, every one of our servicemen does something to make the people's lives better. As they liberate a village they bring in food and medical supplies; they help rebuild schools, roads and other public services. This is done through and in cooperation with Vietnamese Government officials. It teaches the latter how government should serve the people. It demonstrates to the people that real benefits—not just hollow promises—follow allegiance to their own government. It also demonstrates to the VC they have chosen the wrong side—many are defecting from the Communist side.

We also have in Vietnam many hundreds of dedicated U.S. civilians in the U.S. Information Service and AID mission. They risk their lives daily to carry the war for men's minds to the rice roots—right inside enemy strongholds. They also help build up the country's economy to make it self-sustaining. They often fly through heavy barrages of antiaircraft fire to drop millions of leaflets urging surrender of the VC and rallying the people to their government. An important part of their ammunition is relief supplies for the people bought by contributions from Americans.

When will we win in Vietnam? No one can predict when or how the military war will end. Right now it looks like the VC effort will intensify for a while, then it could peter out after some months—but terror tactics will continue much longer. Final victory will take a long time. We must win the cold war too. That will be when Vietnam not only is peaceful, but when a strong nation is welded together—able to care for itself against the enemy and to provide a decent life for its people.

What can we at home do to help the cause? (1) Use this document and other data to convince doubters of the importance of America's stake in Vietnam. (2) If you know a serviceman there, write him your apprecia-

February 8, 1966

tion for his bravery and sacrifice—say the same thing to his family here at home. (3) In addition to your regular donation to United Crusade, consider a contribution earmarked for "Vietnamese relief" to an organization such as CARE or Catholic Relief.

Desperate Conditions in the Mississippi Delta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 7, 1966, carried an article by Gene Roberts entitled "Delta Area of Mississippi in Turmoil." It speaks of the growing militancy in this predominantly Negro cotton-producing section.

Unrest in the delta stems from mounting unemployment due to farm mechanization and crop reduction programs. Farm employment is expected to be reduced by another 25 to 50 percent.

The Negro farmworkers feel they have not been reached by civil rights legislation and that the Federal Government is, in part, responsible for their plight. The article says further that no one expects the new Office of Economic Opportunity programs to come anywhere near meeting the need of the people.

I commend Gene Roberts, the New York Times reporter, for bringing these deplorable conditions to the attention of America. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1966]

DELTA AREA OF MISSISSIPPI IN TURMOIL

(By Gene Roberts)

GREENVILLE, Miss., February 6.—Aunt Noff's Cafe was crowded one afternoon last week in nearby Sunflower, but the bright posters that advertised a cheap brand of beer and a still cheaper soft drink were failing to drum up any business.

"We can't buy no nothing," said 51-year-old Sam Watts, speaking for the 16 Negroes who were huddled around the coal burning stove in the dim cafe. "There ain't one of us that's hit a lick of work since before January. The white man got all the jobs."

Frustration like that of Mr. Watts is commonplace in the alluvial plain that is known locally as the Mississippi Delta—the predominantly Negro cotton-producing arc from the intersection of the Mississippi River and the Tennessee State line to Vicksburg 200 miles downriver.

There is growing social ferment in this land. There is also growing militancy, which sometimes turns to cold anger, in the young civil rights movement.

Last week, 110 impoverished Negroes and civil rights workers seized a deactivated Air Force barracks at Greenville, then kicked, spit, and cursed the military policemen who ejected them.

Next, airbase demonstrators and other jobless Negroes moved to Strike City, a collection of tents and one wooden assembly hall near Greenville. They were built by 60 Negroes who were evicted from delta plantations last summer after waging an unsuccessful farm strike.

Now, with Strike City's population swollen to 160 by the new influx, residents are denouncing the Air Force's action and talking vaguely of "forming our own government."

Their traditional winter problems of inadequate food and widespread unemployment have been compounded this year by sub-freezing temperatures and by continuing farm automation and new Federal production controls that threaten to reduce springtime farm employment by 25 to 50 percent.

Civil rights legislation, meanwhile, has forced the White Citizens Council into disarray. Civil rights workers are moving across barren and muddy fields, from one clapboard plantation cabin to another, carrying out voter registration drives and forming community action groups.

James Phipps, a young Mississippi Negro who wears an Irish Republican Army-type trench coat, flits through the delta denouncing the "white man's government" and praising Jomo Kenyatta, the African leader who once led the terrorist Mau-Mau.

"Boppers"—a name, hazy in origin, that has been given by established civil rights organizations to freelance, Northern activists—drive or hitchhike down the delta highways, looking for civil rights "action" and leaving in their wake religious tracts and such publications as the Communist Party's the Worker and the Socialist Workers Party's the Militant.

A WELCOME RECEPTION

Visitors—whether they be reporters, civil rights workers' or boppers—are usually welcome at cabins whose occupants see little hope of farm employment this spring.

Three nights ago at an unpainted cabin in rural Bolivar County, 40 miles from Greenville, Dave Rockemore, his wife, an 81-year-old aunt, a daughter-in-law, five children and two grandchildren sat around their wood-burning heater before retiring for the night in the cabin's three beds.

They had just finished their supper of pork neckbones, water, sirup and "flour bread," and were eager to talk of their lives and "tell it the way it is."

"The boss man told me in November we could stay on in this house free," said Mr. Rockemore, who is 55, "but he say there won't be anything for anyone in the family to do on the farm but me, and that'll be a mighty little bit."

NO HOPE FOR SPRING

"There won't be as much cotton planted this year," Mr. Rockemore continued, "and the boss says he's broke and needs to use chemicals on the weeds this year instead of cotton choppers. I ain't had a single day of work since the first day of November and now there ain't any hope for spring."

The only income "earner" in the family is Mr. Rockemore's Aunt Mary, who took a dollar of her \$46-a-month welfare check to buy the neckbone for the family's supper.

The neckbone "didn't make it around the table twice," said Mrs. Rockemore, but it "tasted good" after the family's winter diet of Government-provided farm commodities—grits, rice, flour, canned beef, meal, and dried milk.

Three miles up a dirt road from Mr. Rockemore's cabin lives John Usher, 47, who had been counting on "picking up pecans" this winter to supplement his family's diet, but now even that hope is gone.

GOVERNMENT IS RESENTED

"Some winters, I used to make \$7 or \$8 and even \$9 a day picking up pecans along the levees where they grow wild," Mr. Usher said, "but this year they got the land posted and they'll fine you if you get on it."

He thought the Federal Government had posted the land, but a spokesman for the levy board said that the Government held only an easement on the land, and that it had been posted by the timber companies who owned it to "minimize the possibility of forest fires."

The Federal Government, as often the planter, is the target of Negro farmworkers' bitterness. They do not feel they have been reached by new civil rights legislation.

In Sunflower, which lies 35 miles east of

Greenville, Anderson Maples studied the patent medicine calendar in his four-room cabin and observed that it would be a "long time 'til spring."

"Somebody killed us on the cross," he said. "I don't know who it was, but I believe it was the Government or something."

Mr. Maples had no complaint about "Mr. Jack," the plantation owner, who provides free housing and coal and pays medical and electricity bills. Still, he said, things were better 10 years ago when a man could farm on shares. Then the Government commenced to pay landowners for not growing cotton, and some of the landowners used the money to buy tractors and mechanical cotton pickers, and soon there wasn't much left to do but drive tractors at \$5 a day.

Mr. Maples left his sitting room, which was crowded by 12 children and grandchildren, a bed and a potbellied stove, and walked outside. There, he said that he had had "nary a day of work" since the first of January.

Joe Smith, 72, walked over from a neighboring cabin and observed that what Mr. Maples said also applied to him. As Mr. Smith talked, he kicked up the muddy earth with his shoes. His left shoe was a black wing-tipped design, his right one plain and brown.

UNITED STATES AIDS THE POOR

Three days ago, in an attempt to ease the poverty in the delta and throughout Mississippi, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced that it had approved a \$1.2 million grant for the Mississippi Department of Public Welfare to use in hiring 3,000 poor persons to distribute \$24 million in surplus farm commodities over the next 6 months.

The grant will double the present commodity program and reach an estimated total of 600,000 persons in families whose income is under \$3,000 a year. This represents almost a third of the State's total population.

Better yet, in the view of some delta Negroes, it will mean that the flow of commodities will continue into the spring and summer, when six delta counties have traditionally ended the program to insure that Negroes made themselves available for cotton chopping.

It will also bolster the State's welfare program in a period in which the average payment for a family with dependent children has declined \$6 to \$33.19 a month because of "insufficient legislative appropriations."

Meanwhile, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor are financing for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Mississippi a \$7.2 million job retraining program and also underwriting preliminary planning for Government-financed job centers and community action programs in key delta counties.

PROBLEMS STILL REMAIN

In view of coming labor upheavals on the delta plantations, however, no one is predicting that the poverty programs will amount to more than a first step toward alleviating the region's economic problems.

The Mississippi State Employment Security Commission says that by spring the number of tractor and farm mechanic jobs in 18 delta counties will have declined by 25 percent to 19,500 and the "hired work force" of cotton choppers by about 50 percent to a total of 7,000.

Such reductions appear inevitable, according to the commission's labor analysts, because of continuing farm mechanization and a new Federal subsidy program that is attacking cotton surpluses by offering farmers 10.5 cents a pound on average cotton yield for production cutbacks of up to one-third.

Thus, the long-range outlook is for more out-of-State migration in an area where the migration toll has already been severe. A recent study by Mississippi State Univer-

February 8, 1966

levels of economic activity. Appropriations have already been made for many programs, and in some instances to fail to make additional appropriations for programs already in operation might create future costs that would make such actions uneconomic.

However, there are many areas where it is still possible to minimize the level of expenditure. Poverty programs can be downgraded, urban renewal and mass transportation programs delayed, and hospital modernization deferred. Proposals that have strong inflationary impact such as the extension of minimum wage laws, both in scope and level, should be sidetracked. Expenditures for foreign aid, and other State Department programs, particularly in places such as Rhodesia, should be critically reviewed.

We are not advocating, at this time, a tax program that would drain off excess purchasing power. It is felt that a responsible fiscal program on the part of the Congress can protect the country from the devastating effects of inflation. For those who feel that it would be inhuman to cut back on some of our social programs, let them contemplate that the proposed recipients of benefits under medicare programs passed in 1965 would lose far more than those benefits in terms of lowered purchasing power if we permit an inflation to affect the cost of the basic necessities of life.

The Associated Industries of Alabama does not advocate any specific program but does point out that the level of Government spending should be so devised as to at least be brought into close balance with receipts during this period of tremendous economic activity.

There are a few specific items in the field of taxation which should be noted. Associated Industries of Alabama has repeatedly urged that Congress recognize the inequities inherent in double taxation of corporate earnings. While the credit against tax in respect of dividends was only a token move in this direction, for some reason this was opposed by the Treasury Department and was written out of the Internal Revenue Code in the Revenue Act of 1964. This association feels that that action was a move in the wrong direction.

At present there are only two generally applicable elements of relief against double tax on corporate earnings. One is in subchapter S of the code, and the effects of those provisions are of such limited application that the great body of U.S. citizens which owns equity securities suffers from discrimination. The only practical relief available for these individuals at the lower levels of income is in the exclusion from income of the first \$100 of dividends. The more affluent holders of equity securities are often in a position to find means of avoiding this double taxation from other sections of the code which are related to combinations, liquidations, or various special exemptions. Efforts by the Treasury Department to plug the avenues followed by such individuals only tend to make our tax laws more chaotic.

Associated Industries of Alabama is opposed to proposals that would lead to the imposition of capital gains taxes on differences between cost and market values of assets donated to charitable institutions or upon assets included in estates at date of death. In the first instance, there would be a significant impact upon the level of contributions made to religious and educational bodies which would lead either to a curtailment of their activities or in the latter case to reliance upon the Government for support.

In the latter instance, particularly in the smaller and medium sized estate, the tax take would in many cases be substantially increased and result in an inadequate residue being left for an aged spouse. On the other hand, in the case of the larger estate the impact would be proportionately less severe,

because the tax imposed would in a large part serve to reduce the amount of estate tax to be paid.

In summary, these remarks suggest that the Congress must avoid in its fiscal programs anything that would tend to push us further on the road toward inflation, recognizing that we are committed on a major military venture. This is not an attempt to debate the objectives of a Great Society, but merely is designed to assure that we have a democratic society left when we can return to a period of normalcy.

Mutual Radio Survey on Vietnam Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today I received the Mutual Radio national survey on the opinion of the American people in the way they have supported the President in his handling of the Vietnam situation.

The high percent who feel the President has worked diligently and is continuing to serve the cause of peace is very heartening. I am happy to present this survey so that all my colleagues may have the benefit of its information.

The survey follows:

New York City, February 3.—Nearly two-thirds of the American men agree that President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations and that bombing should be resumed, including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before.

This was revealed on Mutual Broadcasting System's 25-minute evening news review, "The World Today," in a special report by George Hamilton Combs.

The report was based on a national survey conducted for Mutual by Sindlinger & Co. In charge of the survey for the network was Raymond T. Anderson, Mutual's director of research.

The Sindlinger survey follows:

On January 27, 28, and 29 we conducted another national study on attitudes and opinions on Vietnam. In summary, here is how the Nation currently responds to the Vietnam situation.

President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	61.1	53.6	57.2
Disagree.....	12.3	13.2	12.8
No opinion.....	26.6	33.2	30.0

Opinion on resuming bombing as before Christmas:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	64.6	41.3	52.5
Disagree.....	8.0	16.3	12.3
No opinion.....	27.4	42.4	35.2

Opinion on including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before:

[In percent]			
	Males	Female	Total
Agree.....	63.1	27.2	44.5
Disagree.....	11.9	17.9	15.0
No opinion.....	25.0	54.9	40.5

Opinion on sending as many ground troops as are required:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	67.0	50.9	58.7
Disagree.....	15.2	13.5	14.3
No opinion.....	17.8	35.6	27.0

Attitude of choice selection on Vietnam situation:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
1st choice is go all out and defeat Hanoi.....	44.6	24.0	33.9
2d choice is to prevent takeover of South Vietnam.....	27.9	32.6	30.3
No opinion on either choice.....	27.5	43.4	35.8

As the above shows—for all questions almost 3 out of every 4 males had an opinion, whereas among females the no-opinion level was much higher. This is usually the case on questions of this nature.

When attitudes and opinions are projected to all individuals who expressed a response to each question, here is how the findings tabulate:

Base: 100 percent or 124,294,000—all individuals 18 years and older; or 86,984,000 had an opinion on whether President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations; 81.8 percent agree, 18.2 percent disagree.

Opinion on resuming bombing as before Christmas:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	64.6	41.3	52.5
Disagree.....	8.0	16.3	12.3
No opinion.....	27.4	42.4	35.2

Opinion on including Hanoi and other targets not bombed before:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	63.1	27.2	44.5
Disagree.....	11.9	17.9	15.0
No opinion.....	25.0	54.9	40.5

Opinion on sending as many ground troops as are required:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
Agree.....	67.0	50.9	58.7
Disagree.....	15.2	13.5	14.3
No opinion.....	17.8	35.6	27.0

Attitude of choice selection on Vietnam situation:

[In percent]			
	Male	Female	Total
1st choice is go all out and defeat Hanoi.....	44.6	24.0	33.9
2d choice is to prevent takeover of South Vietnam.....	27.9	32.6	30.3
No opinion on either choice.....	27.5	43.4	35.8

February 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

who, like Dr. Goldwyn, ranks high in his profession.

In any event, their work, as emphasized in their recent paper, is commendable and extremely vital, because we must make sure, as best we can, the sooner, the better, that neither nuclear substances, nor chemical or biological agents, are utilized in warfare, or allowed in any way through experiments, or in other ways, to pollute our atmosphere and destroy human life, animal life, plantlife, and work havoc and desolation in the world.

To the extent that this article, the work of these distinguished, young medical doctors alerts us to the dangers of chemical and biological warfare in timely fashion, it is up to us to take the pertinent warnings that they have given us to heart and intensify our efforts for proper controls.

Few objectives could be more urgent; few more immediate; few more challenging.

We have tried again and again to seek suitable controls, instead of the entirely feeble and inadequate machinery that we have today, little better than none, to prevent the use of toxic and nuclear destructive weapons in warfare.

But we cannot achieve this crucial goal by our own efforts alone. Only Russia and her satellite group can possibly remedy this situation by joining even belatedly in our proposed control agreements and conventions, and I hope that they take this action sooner rather than later, when great destruction may be wrought and unimagined horror and desolation may be visited upon the world.

We have ultimately Red China, too, to consider in our search for these controls, but the penetration of the hard-core Marxist armor of that nation is a very formidable task.

But let us persist in the struggle for rationality and sanity in ridding mankind of the ghostlike shadows of extinction that hang over the world like a black pall.

Surely somewhere in the rocky facades of monolithic totalitarianism there must be some fissures through which the light of reason can penetrate into the minds and hearts of the leaders of great nations now seemingly unmoved by the glowering shadows of impending doom.

If the pointed warnings of these talented young scientists are duly heeded in every nation, starting with our own, perhaps hope will replace despair; perhaps men can again act like human beings and outlaw all destructive and toxic substances in warfare, lay down their swords of extinction and set up an enduring peace.

I highly commend Dr. Goldwyn and Dr. Sidel upon their very scholarly and timely paper and wish them well in their endeavors to cast light upon the dark ideological recesses that menace the existence and the progress of the human race on this earth.

The article follows:

TWO HUB DOCTORS RAISE ISSUE—GERM WARFARE DANGERS CITED

(By Herbert Black, Medical Editor)

Physicians everywhere were urged today by two Boston doctors to question the moral

and even practical justification for use of chemical or biological warfare.

Such warfare is likely to be used on civilian populations and could cause epidemics of disastrous proportions, warned Dr. Victor W. Sidel and Dr. Robert M. Goldwyn.

They said physicians have a special responsibility because they may be asked to develop these weapons and they would have to treat the victims of them.

They protested what is sometimes called the "humane aspects" of many of the biologic and chemical agents, declaring that "once the Pandora's box has been opened, military commanders will select the most lethal weapons."

Sidel and Goldwyn, members of the executive of Physicians for Social Responsibility, a Boston-founded national group, declared that any condoning of bacterial or chemical weapons would seem to be a tragic reversal of medical progress and a rejection of the Hippocratic oath.

"Many of the biologic weapons," they said in the New England Journal of Medicine, "can trigger afflictions that physicians have labored for centuries to eradicate."

Drs. Sidel and Goldwyn trace the origins of chemical and germ warfare from the poisonous arrows of ancient Asia and Western Europe, through World Wars I and II to the defoliating and crop-destroying substances and the irritating, but nonlethal tear and nausea gases employed against the Vietcong.

They define chemical agents as those chemicals toxic to man, animals and plants, excluding explosives, smoke, flame and incendiaries.

Biological weapons they defined as "living organisms or their toxic products whose use causes death, disability or disease in man, animals, plants and food supplies.

Chemical agents toxic to man are listed in six categories, three nonlethal and three lethal. The nonlethals include irritants such as tear gas and agents that cause coughing and nausea.

They also include vesicants (blistering agents like mustard gas). These can be particularly damaging because victims may remain in poisonous atmosphere until severe damage is done.

The third non-lethal chemical is the hallucinogen. The most frequently discussed of these is LSD, the odorless, tasteless and colorless chemical that can cause psychological reactions and psychoses. The drug could be introduced into water supplies or possibly placed in food.

(LSD is the drug with which some college students in the United States have been experimenting. Doctors Sidel and Goldwyn point out that a danger in this drug is that persons taking it either knowingly or unknowingly may be unaware of their altered behavior under its influence.)

The lethal agents described are gases that attack the nerves, the lungs and certain enzymes. Nerve gases, the authors say, are the newest, the most effective and the most likely to be used.

They are described as colorless and odorless organic phosphates which enter the body either as gases via the lungs, or as liquids through the skin. High concentrations of these can kill on a single inhalation.

Listed also were those agents that result in the concentration of abnormal fluid levels in the lungs. One of these, prussic acid, is used for executions in gas chambers.

As for biological weapons, an important feature must be to find protection for civilians because of the insidious nature of airborne organisms.

Masks or filters in ventilating systems will provide some protection. Decontamination is a protective measure, the doctors said, "but it is not easy to achieve." So far there are few vaccines against airborne bacteria and medical treatment would be hard to carry out.

Dr. Sidel, who is director of the preventive

medicine unit at Massachusetts General Hospital, and Dr. Goldwyn, associate in surgery at Peter Bent Brigham and Beth Israel Hospitals, emphasize that use of chemical or biological weapons would hit hardest among the young, the elderly, and the infirm.

The doctors, both on the faculty of Harvard Medical School, declared physicians must carefully evaluate their attitudes toward their rights and duties both as citizens and doctors in regard to the development of such weapons and their possible use.

Alabama Industrialists Oppose Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are concerned about the fiscal policies of the Johnson administration. The deficit spending theory is open to serious question. It has never worked in creating permanent prosperity and it could lead to a complete breakdown of our economic system through runaway inflation and a continued erosion of the dollar.

Federal spending and deficit financing was ably discussed at the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama by Mr. John V. Van Pelt III, vice president, finance and controls, Vulcan Materials Co., of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Van Pelt's report follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING AND POSITION ON CAPITAL GAINS
(Statement in the tax field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by John V. Van Pelt III, vice president, finance and control, Vulcan Materials Co., Birmingham, Ala.)

The Associated Industries of Alabama has stated its position in prior years that it is opposed to continued deficit spending. Last year it was pointed out that the administrative budget does not tell the true story, since total spending, including that against prior year appropriations and spending from trust funds, has exceeded receipts in every fiscal year since 1962.

In 1965 the administration proposed, and the Congress approved, a variety of programs which will, over the future, add to the load of expenditures. In certain instances money to instrument these programs has not been appropriated. Additionally it has developed that our involvement in Southern Asia is placing new, and fantastic, demands on the Treasury. While it might have been theoretically possible a year ago to produce a budget balance, under present conditions that objective would hardly be realistic. The best we can hope to do is to minimize the imbalance between receipts and expenditures. However, this situation makes it even more important that every effort be made to curtail expenditures that are not immediately necessary.

Surely the citizens of the United States do not want a managed economy, with price and wage controls, nor do they want rampant inflation. The only way such a managed economy can be avoided, without accepting inflation as a way of life, in the face of the demands of an enlarging military commitment is to drastically curtail artificial stimuli which might otherwise increase

As the above shows, for all questions almost three out of every four males had an opinion, whereas among females the no-opinion level was much higher. This is usually the case on questions of this nature.

When attitudes and opinions are projected to all individuals who expressed a response to each question, here is how the findings tabulate:

Base: 100 percent or 124,294,000—all individuals 18 years and older; or 86,984,000 had an opinion on whether President Johnson has done all he can to settle the Vietnam war through negotiations—81.8 percent agree, 18.2 percent disagree; or 80,582,000 had an opinion on resuming bombing—81 percent agree, 19 percent disagree; or 73,975,000 had an opinion on including Hanoi and other important targets not yet bombed—74.8 percent agree, 25.2 percent disagree; or 90,712,000 had an opinion on sending more ground troops to Vietnam if required—80.4 percent agree, 19.6 percent disagree; or 79,879,000 had an opinion on what our choice was in Vietnam—52.8 percent say we should attempt to defeat Hanoi, 47.2 percent say we should simply prevent the takeover of South Vietnam.

ROBERT E. McCUMBER,
Public Relations Director.

A Treasure Worth Conserving— Oil Shale Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an editorial published in the January 21, 1966, issue of the Lamar Tri-State Daily News, Lamar, Colo., gives strong support for Senator DOUGLAS' bill, S. 2708, to preserve this country's oil shale deposits.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TREASURE WORTH CONSERVING

Estimates of the size and value of the oil shale deposits in Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah continue upward, staggering the imagination of the layman. This week the U.S. Geological Survey issued a report stating that there is sufficient energy stored in these deposits to meet the needs of the world at the present rate of consumption for the next 18,000 years.

Resources of this magnitude should be conserved for the benefit of the people and not allowed to become the pawn of private interests which gain title by dubious means and exploit the reserves for their personal or corporate welfare. Title to thousands of acres of oil-shale-rich land is now the subject of litigation and it is incumbent upon those who represent the public interest in the courts to put forth their utmost effort to not only prevent any depletion of the share which should go to the people and to militantly battle to recover such assets as may have been put in jeopardy by previous lack of devotion to the public interest.

New Start for Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article that appeared in the highly respected journal, the Economist, of London, February 5, 1966.

The Economist has rubbed some of the gilt paint off the administration proposal. While recognizing the legitimacy of a broad attack on urban problems, the Economist recognizes the fact that the President's assault is only a minor one in terms of possible achievement, but is a major assault in terms of attempted arrogation of power unto the Federal Government in the guise of a helping hand.

As the Economist also notes, there is little reason to doubt that as long as the program is under Housing and Urban Development Department auspices, that demonstration cities will have to submit programs for social renovation. In short, the "commissars" will also be social planners and social intriguers. This sort of thing is unnecessary. On February 7, I announced my intention to seek an amendment of the "demonstration cities" legislation to replace the "Federal coordinator" or "commissar" with an information officer, pure and simple. I intend to press this effort.

I want the cities of America to get their carrots without also having to swallow fishhooks.

The text of the Economist of London follows:

NEW START FOR CITIES

The attack which the President wants to launch on slums and urban blight recognizes the weaknesses in existing efforts to deal with the ills of the cities; these have been uncoordinated and spread too thin and have been too slow moving to have much impact. Individual projects have been widely scattered. What Mr. Johnson now proposes is a pair of demonstration programs. The largest is to show what can be accomplished for big, rundown tracts in the centers of cities when all the resources of government—local, State, and Federal—and of private bodies are concentrated on the task. For this he is asking \$2.3 billion, over 6 years, almost as much as Congress authorized last year for 4 years of urban renewal programs all over the country. Some 60 or 70 cities, of varying sizes, are expected to win the privilege of being the guinea pigs. In addition there is a small program of incentives to reward some 20 or so metropolitan areas which show that they can plan successfully for the future—and which are prepared to put their plans into effect.

The demonstration cities will have to submit schemes for the renovation, social as well as physical, of substantial areas; the President spoke, in his housing message, of transforming the complete environment of as many as 100,000 people at one go—a tacit admission that up to now central business

districts have hogged too much of the urban renewal show. Now the provision of housing for poor people and those of moderate means—along with the schools, community centers, health clinics, parks, and playgrounds which they need—will take pride of place. In each city there will be a Federal coordinator who will hold the purse strings and will be responsible for seeing that Federal resources are meshed together. The Federal Government will shoulder most of the public cost. In return, Mr. Johnson, as is his custom, will expect visible results, fast; the cities should be "masterpieces of civilization" and must not be allowed to rot.

For all the President's anxiety for results, the money will not start to flow until July 1967, when it is hoped that the present budget pinch will have eased. Congress will be asked to appropriate only a few million for planning before then—a modest beginning which will make it easier for it to swallow a commitment which has almost unlimited capacity for growth. Already the New York Times is pointing out that New York City—or Chicago—or Los Angeles—could swallow up the whole \$2.3 billion. However, what will exercise Congress most when hearings start next month is the proposal to create Federal coordinators. Are they to persuade or to command? Congressman FINO, a Republican from New York, prophesies gloomily that there will be not a nickel for cities that do not bow down to the new "Federal commissars."

Budget Cuts Hit School Milk and Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, several items in the administration's 1967 "guns and butter" budget deserve very careful congressional scrutiny. For some inexplicable reason, the programs insuring milk and lunches for schoolchildren have been especially hard-hit by senseless reduction of funds.

According to the proposed budget, \$19 million is slated to be deleted from the school lunch program. Another "saving" is made at the expense of the special milk program which is cut from \$103 million to an estimated \$21 million. These reductions of \$19 and \$82 million, respectively, are both unsound and unjustified by the facts and nature of the programs they will drastically curtail. Providing milk and lunches for school-age children have been important, efficiently executed, and well administered programs receiving well-deserved praise and effecting sound nutritional benefit to the Nation's schoolchildren.

I urge the appropriate committees examining this facet of the budget to take every step necessary to ascertain that the special milk and school lunch programs do not become the victims of irresponsible budget cuts.

February 8, 1966

Strategy of Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, State Controller Alan Cranston, of California, recently issued a statement on the strategy of silence on the civil rights issue. His statement is both timely and significant; and presents a great challenge to all who believe in human rights. The statement follows:

BEVERLY HILLS, October 26.—State Controller Alan Cranston reported today that California's political leaders are being showered with advice to adopt a strategy of silence on the civil rights issue.

Cranston said without qualification that he does not subscribe to that strategy now nor will he in next year's election campaign.

"The guarantee of constitutional rights and equal opportunities for all citizens is an issue as vital to the progress of California as it is deeply rooted to my own sense of conviction," he said.

"I will act to advance that guarantee and speak out to advocate that equality whenever or wherever my efforts may be helpful."

In a luncheon address to the Women's Democratic Club of Beverly Hills and the Brent-Air Democratic Women's Club Cranston said that "the strategy of silence was conceived in a climate of fear flowing out of the violence in Watts."

Elected officials and potential candidates of both parties, he added, "are being urged to do nothing, say nothing and think nothing about racial discrimination."

"We are warned constantly about the alleged intensity of a 'white backlash' in California," Cranston disclosed. "We are told by many self-styled political professionals to sweep this social problem under a rug of platitudes until after next year's election."

Cranston cited two of many recent examples of the "widespread view that political necessity dictates a stance of silence by elected officials."

The first, he related, was a letter he received from a Republican friend which said in essence:

"DEAR ALAN: * * * I saw the news story in which you called for calm concern and understanding for the causes and implications of the Watts riots. * * * I agree with everything you said, but please don't talk about this any more because it will cost you votes in the suburbs * * *"

The second example, Cranston said, was an informal conversation he had with a veteran Democratic campaign worker:

"He told me that I should not use the word 'justice' in any public statement. He said seriously that the word carried too many negative implications for the Californian anxious about the Negro problem."

"The day in which the concept and the word of 'justice' becomes off-limits for public officials is the day in which we are lost as a free people and a democratic society," Cranston declared.

The State controller emphasized that California—with its "excellent record in civil rights"—has no basis for shame, and that its people—with the firm and sensible leadership of Governor Brown and other Democratic leaders—have no cause to fear the future.

"But we must resist the pleas for expedience, timidity, and silence by those with little appreciation of California's record of progressive civil rights legislation and with little

faith in the basic decency and sense of fairness of the vast majority of our people.

"Civil rights is not simply a legal issue. Equal opportunities for all citizens cannot be guaranteed by laws alone. This issue is also linked directly to economic conditions, law enforcement problems, moral considerations, and social attitudes.

"This challenge will not disappear if we ignore it. It is there. It is complex. It is difficult. It demands positive attention, responsible action, and calm public discussion."

Additional excerpts of Cranston's address follow:

"Civil rights has been the predominant domestic public issue of the past decade. It will continue to be a prime social challenge throughout the next.

"California can be proud of its achievements to date, in such areas as voting, education, employment and public accommodations. We stand high compared with all other States in our record on civil rights. But today our need is not to be reminded of how well we have done, but rather how much there is yet to do.

"The fundamental question now is: Shall we continue to make democracy more of a reality for all citizens? Our response will reflect the maturity of our State. The tragedy of Watts should in no way diminish our efforts on many fronts. For even while we move to assure equal opportunity and protection under law, so must we meet all violence and disregard of law with swift and firm action. The two principles are compatible. They are different sides of the same coin.

"Our society is built upon a legal system which provides:

"First, an arena for the peaceful resolution of issues and conflicts.

"Second, rules of conduct and the means of enforcement.

"Third, procedures of redress for those against whom civil wrongs are inflicted and whose constitutional rights are abused.

"Social order depends substantially upon how well this system operates, and upon our own conscious efforts to maintain it. The greatest burden of freedom is the responsibility to preserve it; freedom is responsibility. The two are indivisible. Where one ceases, so does the other.

"If we stand idle while any number of individuals are denied political expression, a decent education, economic opportunity, an equal protection of the laws, the system will fail to fulfill its purpose—and public disorder will eventually ensue.

"Such disorder will drastically impair everyone's pursuit of happiness and undermine the security of every citizen's life and property.

"It is not enough that a significant majority of us enjoy the guarantees of the Bill of Rights, the equal protection of law—in short, our civil liberties and rights. If they do not exist for some of us, they exist in fact that much less for all of us. That is the ultimate importance of civil rights as a practical issue today.

"During this United Nations Week, we are more aware that our response is of concern not only to California and our Nation, but to all the world. America's greatest influence internationally is not military strength or economic wealth. It stems from our standards of excellence, justice and the individual freedom and dignity.

"Today, two-thirds of the world's population is colored. The majority of this country is a minority in the world. If we deny the minorities of our country the opportunity for an excellent life, the security of justice and the fulfillment of individual freedom, we can never earn the trust and respect of the world's majority. We cannot advance freedom and build the conditions of peace throughout the world when we are unable

to secure freedom for all American citizens. It just cannot be done.

"Defeat of the Communist threat abroad will never be achieved while racial discrimination persists at home. And our pledges and promises in the forums of the United Nations will sound shallow unless we achieve a deeper realization of freedom and justice in every community and neighborhood of our State and Nation."

What Does Term "GI" Stand For?

SPEECH
OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, few people will recall what the initials "GI" stand for, since they were first heard in the American idiom 25 years ago. Those of us who can recall the oversized—or worse still, the undersized—shoes, moth-eaten horse blankets—wrap leggings and olive drab longjohns cut by the Klan costumer, cannot forget that these letters stood for "General Issue."

General issue meant that somewhere, hidden away in the loft of the War Department, a descendant of Rumpelstiltskin drew a mental picture of the average American male.

This average American male was put together like a patchwork quilt. The Army clothing specialist took the feet of a Kentucky backwoodsman, the shoulders of a Texan, the thighs of an Oregon tree-topper, the calves of a Tennessee ridgerunner, one arm from a North Carolina cottonpicker and the other from a south Brooklyn straphanger. He put them together and added a waist band modeled on the Lincoln Highway and this became the general issue of clothing which was handed to freshmen recruits of the class of 1940. This class was truly average because it was both underage and overage.

The motivation of this calculated misfitting was a bit of pure military psychological genius:

The enlistee who put on his Army uniform for the first time looked into the mirror and could not wait to get to the front where he could dig a foxhole and get out of sight to cover his shame.

The Army, however, was not without compassion. It, too, recognized that general issue left the soldier far short of being one of the world's 10 best-dressed men, or for that matter, even a competitor in a Watutsi-Burundi fashion contest.

It demonstrated this compassion by covering the whole collection of sags, stretches, seams and scratches with a magnificent great coat. This great coat, complete with brass buttons that turned green on the 17th of March 1918, was belted in the back midway between the shoulders and the hem for a very definite purpose. Since its collar covered the man's head and its hem reached to his heels, by noting the belt in the back and the middle row of buttons in the

3. WAGES

The central point of the past 5 years' history in this country is that economic forces, like those of nature, can be shaped to human purpose without compromising the principles of the free society. Three myths have given way before the exercise of purposive good sense: that there had to be cycles of depression and prosperity; that the price of technological advance had to be unemployment; and that poverty was implacable.

Now the question is raised whether the price of prosperity in this country has to be, as it has so often been in the past, wage and price inflation; or more particularly, so far as the subject of today's discussion is concerned, whether there can be full employment without creating wage increase pressures which will lead to inflationary spiraling.

There is already, at the 5-year point in this period of unprecedented economic growth, considerable disproof of the theories of the inevitability of wage and price inflation in a period of advancing prosperity and decreasing unemployment.

Wage increases have stayed in line, in general, with increasing productivity. In fact, real compensation per man-hour rose at an average rate of 3 percent a year between 1960 and 1965, which was less than the increase in productivity.

Unit labor costs have remained remarkably level. In manufacturing industries, they rose only one-fifth of 1 percent a year during the 5-year period between 1959 and 1964. That compared with an average rise in manufacturing unit labor costs of 3.2 percent a year during the preceding 12-year period. And while these costs stayed virtually level in this country between 1959 and 1964, they went up by 11 percent in Japan, 12 percent in the United Kingdom, 15 percent in Sweden, 21 percent in West Germany, 27 percent in France, and 28 percent in the Netherlands.

In 1965, just ended, there were larger increases in both wages and prices than had been true in the preceding 4 years.

A study of major collective bargaining agreements negotiated during the first 9 months of 1965 shows annual average wage increases during the period of the contract of 3.3 percent. (The first year average increase was 4.2 percent, with substantially lower increases during subsequent years.) This study does not include fringe benefits in either the increases or the base upon which the increase percentages are computed.

Two recent surveys of union wage scale changes in the building and construction industry (not included in the study referred to in the preceding paragraph) show that union scales in seven key trades were 3.9 percent higher in January 1965 than in January 1964; and that the rise between July 1964 and July 1965 (using a broader coverage of trades) was 4.1 percent. A comparison of average hourly earnings in this industry for the year 1965 as a whole shows a substantially smaller increase over the 1964 average than is reflected in the scale changes. On the other hand, inclusion of fringes along with the scale changes indicates an even larger increase than in the wage rates taken alone.

There are no comprehensive surveys of smaller collective bargaining agreement adjustments (i.e., in terms of number of employees involved) available for 1965. Previous experience indicates that they average less, in terms of wage and fringe increases, than the major agreements. Preliminary reports on wage movements in establishments which are not unionized indicate that they were probably higher, on the average, than those in organized establishments.

The information which is presently available indicates that average compensation per

man-hour in the private economy increased by 3.7 percent in 1965. Average hourly earnings for factory production workers, including premium pay for overtime, increased by 3.1 percent (on a December-to-December basis).

This is the wage record to date. It is, in general, a healthy record. The public notice which has understandably and properly been focused on those cases in which there have been excessive wage increases has tended to obscure the larger fact that the last 5 years have witnessed, overall, an unparalleled demonstration of responsible self-restraint.

The future is less clear.

It is a relevant practical fact that comparatively few major collective bargaining agreements will be negotiated this year.

A good deal of significance attaches to the effectiveness with which the prospective, or potential, manpower shortage situations are met.

It is plain that there will be a strong interaction between what happens to prices and what happens to wages.

Secretary Fowler, Chairman Ackley, and Director Schultze have discussed with the committee the fiscal measures which the President is proposing to the Congress to assure continued stable growth.

There have been adjustments in the national monetary policy.

In addition to this, the President and all of the members of his administration have made clear their commitment to the principles of the stabilization policies embodied in the President's economic message and in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers. This commitment is reflected in a series of affirmative, and in general effective, actions.

The future remains in the hands of the private decisionmakers—which is right in a democracy. The evidence is that the key decisions will be made responsibly, and with sufficient realization that the historic gains of the past 5 years depend upon the continued exercise of this responsibility.

I shall be glad to respond to your questions.

VIETNAM

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly to make the following observation:

During the past several weeks I have noted the issuance of many statements by my colleagues in the Senate relating to the involvement of our Nation in southeast Asia.

I have also noted press reports indicating that there are some Members of the Senate who felt that the action we took on August 6, 1964, in adopting Senate Joint Resolution 189 did not in any way endorse the actions taken by the President.

If I may, I should like to read from the committee report, which was issued on August 6, 1964. The first two paragraphs of the committee report read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, herein-after referred to as the joint committee, having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 189 supporting the President's determination to repel any armed attack against U.S. forces in southeast Asia and to prevent further Communist attacks, report the resolution favorably and recommend that it be passed by the Senate.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The basic purpose of this resolution is to make it clear that the Congress approves the actions taken by the President to meet the

attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia by the Communist regime in North Vietnam. Full support by the Congress also is declared for the resolute policy enunciated by the President in order to prevent further aggression, or to retaliate with suitable measures should such aggression take place.

On August 5, 1964, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress. The message is incorporated in the committee report from which I have read. I wish to quote from the President's message, as follows:

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

The committee report concludes as follows:

The President's message and Senate Joint Resolution 189, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT (for himself and Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator RUSSELL, and Senator SALTONSTALL) to give effect to the Presidential recommendations, by unanimous consent were referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. During the morning of August 6 the joint committee, with Senator FULBRIGHT presiding in executive session, heard Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, and Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

After receiving the testimony the joint committee voted 31 to 1 to report the resolution favorably without amendment.

I am certain that all Members of the Senate have studied this document with great care, because it reports upon a resolution of great significance and importance. I am certain that Senators, in casting their votes in support of the adoption of the resolution, did so only after careful study and consideration.

SENATOR CLARK'S SPEECH BEFORE
THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 5 years ago, population control was a politically taboo subject. Today I think that most Americans agree with President Johnson that a solution to the population explosion is a cause second only in importance to the search for peace. This change in public attitudes came about because farsighted and bold men were willing to speak out.

No man has spoken out more intelligently and courageously on the problem of population control than the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. JOSEPH CLARK was the first man to discuss population control on the floor of the Senate and has consistently encouraged planned parenthood programs in Pennsylvania and throughout the United States.

Recently Senator CLARK delivered a thoughtful address at the annual luncheon of the Planned Parenthood Association of Philadelphia, summarizing the progress made so far in this field, and urging that appropriate local, State, and Federal authorities play a more active role in making birth control information

and advice available on a strictly voluntary basis. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLARK's address be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

"The duty of a politician is not to follow but to lead his constituents in seeking solutions to problems of public concern. But, if he wants to remain an active, rather than a former, public servant, he had better not get so far ahead of his public that he gets shot in the rear.

I have long been an active, if private, supporter of planned parenthood. To me the right to know what needs to be done to prevent the birth of unwanted children is one of the basic freedoms of a just and a compassionate society. To deny that right is unethical, immoral and wicked.

It was not until I was reelected to the Senate in 1962 that I had the courage to speak out. That fall, before the election, I promised my wife that if I won in November I would make my position clear early in the next year. It was not, however, until August 15, 1963, that I addressed the Senate on the topic "The Time Has Come To Speak Out on the Problem of Population Control."

I was, I believe, the first U.S. Senator to so speak out. Since that time I have been followed by Senators GRUENING, TYDINGS, BASS, BARTLETT, BYRD of West Virginia, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, HART, MCGOVERN, MOSS, SIMPSON, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG.

The support of Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, born and brought up in Bryn Mawr, Pa., a Roman Catholic, the father of eight children and one of the most conscientious, high minded men in the Senate, is particularly heartening to me. I should also note that, upon his retirement from the Senate, Kenneth Keating, of New York, now a judge on the New York Court of Appeals, assumed the presidency of the Population Crisis Committee and, all through 1965, performed yeoman service in calling to the attention of the country the seriousness of the population crisis and the need to take prompt action to resolve it.

In the House of Representatives many Congressmen have also spoken up, among them UDALL, DIGGS, MOSS, CONYERS, MACKAY, BROWN, and LONG.

Not all of these men, by any means, can be categorized as "starry-eyed liberals." A number of them usually follow conservative principles.

At the executive level, former President Eisenhower has spoken out, much to his credit, having reversed a stand he had previously taken. In a letter written June 22 of last year to Senator GRUENING, who has been holding most useful hearings on legislation to create executive secretaries for population in both the State and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, President Eisenhower wrote:

"Unless something is done to bring an essential equilibrium between human requirements and available supply, there is going to be not only a series of riotous explosions but a lowering of the standards of all people, including our own. * * * I devoutly hope that necessary measures will be enacted into law * * * so * * * that human and material resources can be promptly mobilized and employed to cope effectively with the great need of slowing down and finally stabilizing the growth of the world's population."

President Johnson has been equally forthright on a number of occasions. In his state of the Union message last year, he said:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

At the 20th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco on June 25, 1965, he said:

"Let us in all our lands—including this land—face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of all the world. Let us act on the fact that less than \$5 invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth."

The White House Conference on Health which met in Washington on November 3 and 4, 1965, had a panel on family planning which reported:

"There is wide general agreement that the time has come in this country to take definitive steps to make family planning services a part of routine medical practice and readily available to those who desire it—particularly those who have previously been unable to secure either information or service. All parts of government must take leadership in cooperation with private groups to establish and maintain family planning services with the understanding that there shall be no coercion and that there is a full freedom of choice of methods to be used in regulating pregnancy. This goal is believed to be in accord with the present wishes of a majority of people of all faiths, of all social and economic levels."

Assuredly, the climate of opinion toward the cause of planned parenthood has changed drastically in the last 3 years.

II

There has indeed been a breakthrough, which I date from the publication of Dr. John Rock's book, "The Time Has Come," early in 1963, with its introduction by former Secretary of State Christian Herter. As most of you know, Dr. Rock is a well-known Catholic professor emeritus of gynecology at the Harvard Medical School. The subtitle of his book is: "A Catholic Doctor's Proposals To End the Battle Over Birth Control."

In a review of Dr. Rock's book quoted in the New York Times on April 20, 1963, Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston, who delivered the invocation at the inauguration ceremonies of President Kennedy in 1961, wrote:

"The Church is not opposed to birth control as such but to the use of artificial means to control births."

In a speech delivered before the Planned Parenthood Federation lunch at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington on May 8, 1963, Dr. Rock said that Catholic doctrine today is no obstacle to a massive program of Government action on the population problem; that many Catholic scholars are as concerned with the tragic consequences of over population and the encouragement of responsible parenthood as are non-Catholics; and that authoritative Catholic teaching encompassed a broad approach of toleration toward those areas of public policy on which there are remaining disagreements. He further stated that, while he did not expect the Catholic Church to reverse its longstanding opposition to artificial contraception, differences of religious approach did not mean that we must be paralyzed:

"In the event of such disagreements, the only democratic solution is enactment of laws and adoption of policies by each public body which respects the deeply held convictions of all groups. Such a policy would remove all restrictions on birth control in public agencies offering all methods so that communicants of all faiths can choose a method in accord with their beliefs."

As reported in the New York Times, June 24, 1965, Cardinal Cushing, speaking about

the effort to repeal the Massachusetts birth control law which prohibited the sale of contraceptive devices said:

"I do not see where I have the obligation to impose my will on those who do not accept the faith I do."

There is now, I believe, an overwhelming consensus in this country—but not in this city—that both information and contraceptive devices should be made available to every human being who wishes to exercise his or her right to know how to prevent conception of an unwanted child. And this consensus includes an overwhelming majority of all three major religious groups, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—including the inhabitants of this city—but not its leadership.

Recent polls show that 8 out of 10 Americans think birth control information should be made available to anyone who wants it. Two years ago, 53 percent of the Catholics interviewed were of this view; by last summer the percentage had increased to 78. These are national figures but there is no reason to think that the percentages are any different in Philadelphia. Planned parenthood clinics report that their clinics include Catholics in a number at least equal to their percentage in a particular community.

A survey conducted in the South by Dr. Joseph Beasley shows that three out of every four Negro women interviewed did not want any more children, but that more than half of them did not know how to stop having them. I suspect that Negro leaders who do not recognize this fact and act accordingly will not long remain the leaders of their people.

I like to think of myself as a practical politician. As such, I have no hesitation in telling you that espousal of the cause of planned parenthood is, in my judgment today, a political asset and not a liability. As Dr. Rock so cogently put it: The time has come to speak out.

III

Let's define more closely what we are talking about. We are concerned primarily with two matters: first, methods; and second, relations between church and state and private agencies. Would not the members of this organization agree with me?

First, that all tested and medically supported methods of voluntarily preventing conception should be made available to all married couples and also, under proper safeguards, to those unmarried mothers from underprivileged social groups who presently have no practical way, in view of the environment in which they live, of protecting themselves from the unwanted child.

Second, that dissemination of this information and the services required to make it effective should be supported not only by voluntary civic organizations such as yours but by the local, State, and Federal governments as well.

Third, that the program should be entirely voluntary, entirely without coercion and that those who have religious scruples should be free to reject the information if they so desire.

Fourth, that the program is an essential part of any successful war on poverty at home or abroad.

Fifth, that both at home and especially abroad, methods of curbing the presently excessive rate of population increase must promptly be put into effect to protect the well-being of the human race and perhaps, indeed, its very survival.

As President Johnson has said: "This cause is second only to the search for peace."

IV

It would be carrying coals to New Castle to dwell at further length on the need for a program of population control. You are all aware of the basic facts. I shall mention only a few in passing:

February 8, 1966

search programs. In the future the college will have to depend increasingly on contributions from individuals and foundations for research funds.

PRIMARY FUNCTION

Towson, despite its new status as a liberal arts college, is still primarily in the business of educating future teachers. If a rapidly growing student body presents its problems, Dr. Hawkins also feels it is a hopeful sign. "After all," he says, "Maryland needs the teachers. Teaching, particularly below the college level, used to be looked down on as a profession. But lately it has gained a new status. Teachers' salaries are higher, but the rewards of teaching are more than financial."

"I forget what philosopher it was who said that civilization is a race between education and catastrophe, but that truth has certainly been emphasized in recent years. Because of the vital importance of education our society views its teachers, at all levels, with a much higher respect than it did a generation ago."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REPLY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 2 the Columnist Richard Starnes made some comments which appeared in the Washington Daily News under the title "Desperate Acts."

Since this commentary deals with events in an interpretive manner, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Starnes' views may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESPERATE ACTS

(By Richard Starnes)

The decision to invoke the UN Security Council is a measure of President Johnson's disquiet over growing criticism of the U.S. role in Vietnam.

The United States, which is treaty-bound to take international disputes to the UN, has refused until now to do so—for the very sound reason that it could not depend on the UN to support it. But the President has obviously concluded that the risks of summoning the Security Council now are smaller than the risks of not summoning it.

The United States is vulnerable on a number of counts in Vietnam, but no more so than in its reluctance to invoke the UN peacekeeping machinery it had such a large hand in creating. If, as the administration contends, we are in Vietnam in response to the plea of a legally ordained government that is the victim of aggression, then the UN is a logical place to turn to for help. We did so to good effect, for example, when South Korea was attacked by North Korea.

But what if the situation in Vietnam is not as we insist it is, but more closely resembles the picture painted by the critics of U.S. intervention? Suppose the fact is that Premier Ky's Saigon government is nothing but a puppet regime imposed by the huge American apparatus? Suppose (as the International Control Commission has alleged) the former Diem government was equally guilty of violating the Geneva accord as Ho's Communist regime from the north? And, above all else, suppose an objective investigation of the origins of the war proves (as many critics of the U.S. insist it must prove) that Diem was invented and installed by the United States solely for the purpose of frustrating the elections that the Geneva treaty ordered? Even Mr. Eisenhower realized that Ho would win if the elections were held in 1956 as the Geneva accord provided.

If this picture of the war is the true one,

then it is easy to see why the United States has avoided summoning the Security Council, and why it does so now with such obvious reluctance. President Johnson obviously took the risky step only because he was compelled to take it in an attempt to quiet widespread doubts regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam.

His brusque reply to the 16 Senators who questioned his policies last week was not calculated to increase the base of his support in Congress. He simply cited the joint resolution of support adopted by the Congress on the heels of the mysterious Tonkin Gulf incident of last year. But Mr. Johnson can have no illusions about the long-term utility of the resolution.

He knows that it was never intended by Congress to be a blank check for a major ground war in Asia. Congress was talking about a different sort of operation, and this is plainly understood at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

In a way the President's reply was most revealing. He spent too long manipulating the Senate not to understand that his reply would enrage a great many Senators. Mr. Johnson is not a man who acts in the heat of passion, so it must be concluded that he ran the risks implicit in his brief, almost insulting reply, only after a cold-blooded assessment of the imperatives under which he is trying to manage the war.

Thus he has taken two major steps in the past week that he must have dreaded taking. He has sought to turn aside growing disquiet in the Congress by telling an influential bloc of Senators that they had already given him a blank check, and he invoked the Security Council when he could have no real assurance that it would support American policy.

The fact is that Mr. Johnson is plagued on one hand by his sincere conviction that American interests require us to deny victory to the Communists in Vietnam, and on the other by the suspicion that the country has no stomach for protracted war in Asia, nor for the huge casualty lists that must be anticipated in such an enterprise.

ANEMIC STATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in a recent address before the Women's City Club of New York, on the status of Federal-State relations, I noted that:

People are more interested in insuring a quality education for their children than in preserving the Michigan or the Montana way of life.

The failure of the States to keep up with the 20th century is now so widespread that it ranks as a major flaw in the State government.

In the February 7 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, Roscoe Drummond points out that the surest way to continue this anemia of the States is to pass the proposed Dirksen amendment on apportionment of State legislatures. Raising the banner of States' rights on the standard of one man, 10 votes, is a most difficult exercise in logic and a retreat from sensibility.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Drummond be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGNESS AND POWER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is a bad mistake that those who are most alert to the danger of the ever-growing bigness and power of the

Federal Government are trying to block the one reform which has the best chance of doing something about it.

Public opinion polls show that most people are concerned to see Government getting bigger and bigger and to see big brother in Washington spending more money to do more things. Most Americans would like less spending, less national welfare statism.

WEAKNESS OF STATES

But the trend goes on. Little is done about it. The reason is that for the most part those who speak out offer no acceptable corrective. They lament the growing power in Washington but do nothing to strengthen State government and it was the weakness of the State governments which caused so many cities to turn to Washington for help.

This is why it seems too incongruous that Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois and other Republicans and conservative southern Democrats should be taking the lead in trying to halt the march of reapportionment of the State legislatures so that the voting districts in each State will be about equal in population.

This is the heart of the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling which the proposed Dirksen amendment would set aside in order to permit one of the two houses of each legislature to be apportioned on other than a population basis.

EQUAL REPRESENTATION

Why is this move to bring about equal representation of all citizens in the State legislatures related to the trend toward an all-pervasive, all-powerful, all-financing Federal Government?

The answer is that the flow of power to Washington just didn't start by itself. The Federal Government did not grab power from the States. It had it thrust upon it by mayors who, beginning with the depression came to Washington pleading with the President and Congress to do things for them which they could not get their own States to do.

And why couldn't they? Mainly because a minority of rural voters held a veto over the will of the majority. They held this veto because malapportionment of the legislatures enabled a minority of the voters to elect a majority of either one or both houses of nearly every State in the Union. In most cases the State constitution required reapportionment every 10 years, but the sitting legislators preferred to violate the constitution rather than risk losing their seats.

I submit that the best way to begin to arrest the flow of political power to Washington is to provide for its better use by the States.

I submit that the best way to do this is to modernize State government and make it answer the will of the majority of voters in each State.

This will be the effect of the reapportionment which is now being carried out in response to the one man, one vote decision of the Court and which in another year or so will be complete—unless the Dirksen amendment is passed and ratified. It lost last year. Mr. DIRKSEN is bringing it up again this year.

POSITION OF THE COURT

The position of the Supreme Court is that it is against the Federal Constitution for either the legislature or the voters to take away from citizens the right to be equally represented; that to make some citizens' votes count one-tenth and other citizens' votes count 10 times as much is robbing a citizen of his right to vote.

I must say that when most Americans were living on farms, I never heard or read of any effort by earlier Dirksens to reapportion the State legislatures so that the minority of voters in the cities could control at least one house in each State.

Only strong and responsive State governments can begin to cut back somewhat a too powerful Central Government.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AGAINST THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for some time, now, I have been concerned over what appears to be a stepped-up campaign to undercut our efforts in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

I have been disturbed over the increase in Communist propaganda to the United States, material which can be said to be a part of the program of the psychological warfare which is being waged against the American people.

This material has been designed to harm our war effort. It is intended to confuse and mislead those who receive it by detracting from the real issues and purposes of the conflict in South Vietnam.

It is because of this concern that I was dismayed to read in this morning's New York Times an article dealing with the reported production by leftists in Los Angeles of radio tapes—as the reporter described it “aimed at undermining the U.S. military effort in Vietnam.”

According to the article, the tapes urge the United States not only to withdraw from Vietnam but suggest ways for American soldiers to avoid military service there.

These tapes are said to be broadcast by radio Hanoi. This can only mean that the broadcasts are being fed to any American or ally listening in Vietnam. It can only mean that the broadcasts are intended to undermine the morale of the allied fighting man there.

The article said the Justice Department is investigating the reported production. But at the same time, the article questions the effectiveness of the investigation by quoting the U.S. District Attorney's office in Los Angeles as saying—and I quote:

It has not yet been determined whether such propaganda was illegal because there had not been a formal declaration of war in Vietnam.

If there is no law on the books which would make the production and distribution of such propaganda illegal, then I believe the appropriate committees of Congress should investigate the matter with a view either to stopping or curtailing such endeavors through appropriate legislation.

The war is difficult enough without permitting this type of propaganda to continue without fear of penalty.

The hardships our soldiers are enduring in Vietnam are severe enough without permitting them to be subjected to broadcasts taped right here in the United States for the purpose of waging psychological warfare against them.

We cannot prevent the broadcasts from originating in Hanoi, but we certainly should be able to do something about tapes being produced in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, the article entitled “Red Propaganda Stirs U.S. Inquiry,” written by

Gladwin Hill, and published in the New York Times of February 8, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RED PROPAGANDA STIRS U.S. INQUIRY—TAPES URGING WITHDRAWAL IN VIETNAM SENT TO STATION

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, February 7.—The Justice Department is investigating the reported production by leftists here of radio tapes aimed at undermining the U.S. military effort in Vietnam.

The tapes urge the United States to withdraw from Vietnam and suggest ways for American soldiers to avoid military service there. They are said to have been broadcast by radio Hanoi.

The U.S. district attorney's office here said that it had not yet been determined whether such propaganda was illegal because there had not been a formal declaration of war in Vietnam.

The principal speaker on the taped commentaries calls himself “Joe Libre” Epstein.

In Washington, the Justice Department said it was investigating the involvement of a Ronald Ramsey, of Los Angeles, in connection with radio broadcasts to American troops in South Vietnam. A spokesman in the office of Attorney General Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach said the investigation had been in progress for 2 weeks. He declined to say how the Government had learned of Mr. Ramsey's involvement or how soon the results of the investigation might be disclosed.

The tapes proclaim their source as “Radio Stateside” and “Radio Liberation.” They first came to light last October, when four half-hour tapes were sent anonymously to radio station KPFF here, apparently in the hope that they might be broadcast.

KPFF is an FM station operated by the nonprofit Pacifica Foundation, whose other stations are KBAI in New York and KPFA in Berkeley. The stations have often given air time to spokesmen with dissenting minority viewpoints.

LEGAL VALIDITY DOUBTED

However, KPFF's manager, Robert Adler, who was doubtful of the legal validity of the material, turned the tapes over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation after recording copies. Portions were presented as views and documentary material rather than in their original propaganda form. They were broadcast on all three Pacifica stations on the weekend of January 9.

Afterward, a person purporting to be the producer of the tapes telephoned KPFF to ask why, if KPFF had not seen fit to broadcast the material as propaganda, the tapes had not been returned. Mr. Adler reminded the caller that the packages had borne no return address.

He said today he had had no communication with the “Radio Stateside” people in the ensuing month.

The Hanoi broadcasts were said to have been monitored in at least one instance by a radio listening post in the United States.

Mr. Adler said his doubts about the validity of the material were aroused particularly by one passage telling the soldiers, “We're not asking you to shoot your commanding officer or sergeant in the back yet—not at this time.”

SECRETARY WIRTZ CALLS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT BELOW 3 PERCENT WITHOUT INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz is one of the ablest men in Government today.

Today he presented to the Congressional Joint Economic Committee a powerful plea for continuing economic policies that can help reduce unemployment below 3 percent.

He made as coherent and persuasive an overall economic case for this administration and this Congress training and education programs as I have seen.

He also asks for the kind of fiscal and monetary policies that will continue to stimulate economic growth.

For Americans, who long for a thriving, abundant nation with such job opportunities for Negroes and teenagers, as well as married men, this is a cheering document.

For those who hope for an America which will not suffer the depressions of the past, the Secretary has documented confident prospects brilliantly.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, and members of the joint committee, you have requested a statement of my views regarding the manpower and stabilization aspects of the present and prospective national economic situation. I question how much, even whether, I can add to Chairman Ackley's illumination of these matters before the committee last week. I shall, in any event, start from and rely upon his comprehensive statement of the relevant facts and from his constrained understatement of the remarkable economic gains which have been made in the past 5 years.

My views proceed from unqualified commitment to the idea that full-employment opportunity—letting that phrase mean all it says—is a proper, practicable, and first priority national objective. This objective allows—in terms of the accepted measurement—for no more than the 2- to 3-percent unemployment which results (i) from “transitional” movement into the work force and from one job to another, and (ii) from the fact that a very few people in the work force (less than one-half of 1 percent) are not prepared to meet its demands. To stand now on the “interim goal” of 4-percent unemployment is to realize that it is in fact only the 10-year line.

This view recognizes employment and unemployment as not only economic but essentially human conditions. It counts underemployment as serious a matter—or almost as serious—as unemployment. It brings into question the definition of “employment” as the filling of whatever jobs the economic system wants filled, and inquiries as well into the extent of use of individual human potentials.

In this view, the aggregate and overall average unemployment figures—which show a remarkable 5-year reduction from about 7 percent in early 1961 to about 4 percent now—are looked at coldly for their concealment of some less attractive facts:

There are still 17 major areas in the continental United States in which unemployment is above 6 percent.

There are still more than 650,000 people—one-fifth of the unemployed—who have been out of work for 15 weeks or longer.

There are still 1½ million “employed” who want to work full time but have only part-time work.

One out of every eight teenagers who are looking for work (half of them only for part-time work) can't find it.

sible courses of action, such as reducing the U.S. buying price for gold. The purpose would be to "deprive gold or its present unlimited convertibility into dollars."

If the United States took this course, they said, it would require "cool heads" and the possibility of losing most of the present U.S. gold stock at first.

A spokesman for Canadian Westinghouse, however, said yesterday: "There has been no effect whatsoever on our capital projects, financing, dividend remittances, idle balances, or buying."

POLICY IS NOTED

He said the company for several years has followed a policy of shifting its sources of materials and components from the United States to Canada, either by initiating manufacture of additional parts in its own plants or by encouraging production in other Canadian plants.

He said Westinghouse in the United States had never suggested this policy be changed.

Canadian General Electric officials say the company has been almost completely autonomous for many years and is actively developing components sources in Canada.

Charles Hay, president of British-American Oil, said: We cannot see how the U.S. guidelines can affect our financial or other relationships with our U.S. affiliate. Nearly all our purchases—about 90 percent—are made in Canada. The exceptions are some exotic chemicals and instruments not available in this country. We expect this pattern to continue."

W. O. Twaits, president of Imperial Oil, said his company handled its own financing, established its own dividend policy and did more than 90 percent of its buying in Canada. He said he did not expect this pattern to change.

He added that, while one might dislike Washington's restraint policy, this could not be discussed without reference to the drain on U.S. resources resulting from foreign aid, defense, and the gold loss.

Mr. Twaits said Canada has a vital stake in helping to maintain the strength of the U.S. dollar as an international currency.

A FRESH LOOK AT VIETNAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is perhaps more qualified than many of us to suggest that we need to take a new look at Vietnam.

Based on conclusions reached after several months of hearings and personal observations made during a recent trip to Vietnam, it has become increasingly clear to Senator KENNEDY that we need to devote as much attention to improving the welfare of the Vietnamese people as we have thus far devoted to preserving their freedom.

And, as Senator KENNEDY points out in a February 8 Look magazine article, the Vietnamese citizen cannot appreciate freedom as long as he is without food, clothing, shelter or means of livelihood.

Unfortunately, our humanitarian efforts have not kept pace with our military efforts. Presently, our AID program in Vietnam has insufficient resources to cope with the more than 1 million refugees who have fled invading Vietcong forces and sought refuge in the already overcrowded cities to the south. And the efforts of the local government to meet this problem have been inadequate.

We must always remember, as President Johnson pointed out in his speech

last April, that we are waging a battle on two fronts in Vietnam—against the invading forces from the north and against poverty and deprivation.

Doubtless, there could be few who would oppose escalating our humanitarian efforts in Vietnam, nor could there be any objection to Senator KENNEDY's recommendation, among others, that we should consider the formation of an international volunteer force—rivaling our military force:

The presence of men whose only concern is the health of the population, the education of the children, the bringing of simple technologies to remote lands, or the development of civilian administrators would be an important defense against future political instability and resultant aggression.

Mr. President, I commend the reading of this article by Senator KENNEDY to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, "A Fresh Look at Vietnam" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRESH LOOK AT VIETNAM

(By EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts)

In a small village in Vietnam recently, I had the opportunity to speak with a village elder. This man had seen 30 years of continuous conflict, two sons had been lost in long-past military engagements, and his crude farm implements lay useless behind his home. He was an exhausted man in an exhausted country. Without my asking, he related the needs of his village—but he was really speaking for Vietnam. "We just want to be free from the terror and weapons of soldiers," he said. "We want our children to read, we don't want them to be sick all their lives, and we want to grow our own food on our own land."

This simple statement of human needs, so pathetically stated, was a crushing description of Vietnam. The months of Senate hearings that I had conducted on Vietnam's refugee problems, while dramatic in airing the hurt of people caught in war, never produced such forceful testimony as did this man in the setting where we talked.

We have been involved in two conflicts in Vietnam. One has been the battle against the terror brought in the name of revolution by the Vietcong guerrillas and the forces from the North. The efforts of the South Vietnamese and of our own American forces in this conflict have been the object of American debate and attention on an almost unprecedented scale. Our Government has taken a position in this endeavor that has been clear and firm. Regardless of individual views, most people both at home and abroad are well aware of this aspect of our policy in Vietnam.

The second conflict in Vietnam—the struggle for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people themselves—has not been waged with the same ferocity. There has been no one firm humanitarian policy understood throughout our Nation or the world. The struggle in Vietnam has not been one that has produced a concern for the most important element in the Vietnam situation—the welfare of the Vietnamese people themselves.

Positive steps have been proposed by our President, who has made clear his commitment to the welfare of the Vietnamese people. In a major address last April, the President discussed the two faces of the conflict in Vietnam. He outlined a program for the economic and social betterment of all south-east Asia. Later, and more specifically, he established Project Vietnam, a program to

encourage American civilian physicians to volunteer their services to Vietnam. In September of last year, he dispatched an eminent specialist on rehabilitation of the handicapped, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, to undertake a special study in that country. The President's concern has stimulated progress in this area.

Yet greater efforts must be undertaken if we are to win the support of these people, for without them and their identification with the democratic governments of the world, the lives of many Americans will have been given to no avail. In the voice of the village elder who described a nation's needs was the clear implication that he was indifferent as to who would supply those needs. Years of fear and deprivation had smothered the concern he may have had for his own personal freedoms. He wanted physical security, education, health, and some form of social justice. While it can be said that we have actively sought to provide for his security, we have yet to fully meet his remaining requests. And it is significant that it is free societies that can best provide these things.

It is the war for the hopes and aspirations of the people that must be escalated in Vietnam. In this land of 16 million people:

There are only 800 Vietnamese doctors, and 500 of these are in the Armed Forces, leaving 300 for the entire civilian population.

Only 28 hospitals have surgical facilities, but 17 of these facilities are idle for lack of physicians.

Eighty percent of the children of Vietnam suffer from worms.

The vast majority of people are illiterate, and what school system did once exist in the countryside has been nearly destroyed by war. Schoolteachers have been prime targets of terrorists. In 1964 alone, more than 11,000 civilians—a high proportion of them teachers—were killed, abducted, or wounded by the Vietcong.

The Nation's production of food, once sufficient to make Vietnam a rice basket for Asia, is so depleted that rice must now be imported to feed the populace.

Local government has been decimated; not one of the 16,000 villages—or their officials—has escaped assassination or terror. Clearly, whatever social institutions once existed for the benefit of the Vietnamese are now crippled or totally ruined by war.

Before I went to Vietnam, the Senate Judiciary Special Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, which I chair, took testimony in over 4 months of hearings from some 40 witnesses on the problem of Vietnam refugees. Our subcommittee was concerned with what was being done for the homeless thousands: What provisions were being made for the estimated 100,000 orphans? Were we meeting the challenge of caring for the human fallout of war—the very people that the Vietcong claimed to champion? And in a larger sense, with Vietnam almost a land of refugees, was the United States beginning to engage in this more difficult battle for popular support?

The testimony given at these hearings indicated that our efforts in this area were not sufficient. The Saigon government, assisted by our AID officials, had only the barest beginnings of a program to meet the needs of the refugees, although they had forecast the presence of 100,000 refugees by July of 1965. Even when the estimate was proven wrong, and the refugee count was greater than 600,000 people, there was still no change in planning, no adequate program set up to handle this massive influx of South Vietnamese, according to a report by the General Accounting Office. And this occurred despite prior knowledge that the escalation of military activity would, and did, lead to a vast increase in displaced civilians.

Moreover, it was discouraging to hear the testimony of representatives of our own Government imply again and again that in Viet-

nam the problem of refugees is just that—a problem and a burden.

By now, there are approximately 1 million such refugees in South Vietnam, or 6 percent of its population. It is as if the population of the six New England States were homeless in America. These are people whose villages have been overrun by the Vietcong, or who are fleeing to urban areas to escape the crossfire of the fighting or the effect of the bombs from our planes. For the most part, they are grouped around the major population centers on the coastline, but hundreds of smaller centers lie inland.

While in Vietnam, I saw for myself the indifference of the Saigon government to the plight of their own. Government officials assured me that the refugee situation was well in hand—yet I inspected one camp of over 600 people without a toilet. Construction was started on seven refugee camps in anticipation of my visit. Work stopped when my plans were temporarily altered. It began again when it was finally possible for me to go.

Many other aspects of my visit to these camps did not ring true. People applauded when our party entered a camp—thanks to minor officials moving through the refugee crowd as cheerleaders. Blankets were distributed in our presence, and repossessed when we left. The paint on buildings was still wet, and roads were freshly cleared and bulldozed. In essence, the behavior of these officials was more typical of people concealing a lack of effort than of men doing their best at a difficult task. To them, these refugees are a burden—but to me, they can be one of our strongest assets in Vietnam.

I recognize that historically it has always been difficult to attend to the concerns of the civilian population in the midst of war. And in Vietnam, the by-product of escalation has been a refugee flow that would tax even the most resourceful officials. It is encouraging that last August, our AID officials established their own separate refugee program for Vietnam. And we know that the many voluntary agencies in the field have patiently continued their traditional work—despite hardships and personal dangers.

But now, perhaps, the opportunity presents itself for a greater devotion of our energies to the refugee problem. Now, more can be done to focus our attention on the Vietnamese people themselves.

I would suggest that, first, the U.S. Government must express an overall humanitarian policy in Vietnam that will rival, in resolve and resources, our military effort. This expression by our Government must be so forceful that there will be no danger of the Saigon government's misreading our desires.

The basis of this policy would recognize the potential of one million refugees—indeed, that of all the people of Vietnam—the potential to educate, train and employ them in useful tasks. Experiences in other refugee situations in Asia illustrate what can be done to productively employ and train idle hands. Cottage industries established through private enterprise or voluntary agencies assist the handicapped or the young and old. Cooperative farms could be organized and built by the refugees themselves, as could resettlement villages, schools or water-conservation projects.

It logically follows that this policy direction would imply the need for more adequate facilities at refugee centers. These centers should be equipped for the activity rather than the storage of people.

Second, this strong expression of government policy should be directed to the rebirth of democratic political action among these people to enhance their future role in their village's or nation's life. And within these settlements, people who before had at least exercised free choice in the selection of vil-

lage leaders could experience greater forms of representation.

Depending upon the time that we would expect people to remain in such settlements, representative government could be fostered. Each refugee camp could elect a council to serve the refugees' interests in the camp itself. And on a national level, refugee representatives could be present in Saigon to assure that the immediate needs of this growing population are met.

The meaning and experience of this kind of activity cannot be minimized in a nation where the idea of a central government responding to individual and local needs is novel.

Third, to assist in these endeavors, it would be wise to recruit men of other nations who have a unique background and experience in the problem of refugees. The men who mastered the problems of refugees following World War II, those who worked in the deserts of the Middle East and more recently in the camps of North Africa have much to offer us. They could be called for this humanitarian purpose, to advise on refugee problems and to assist as intermediaries with the central government and our own Armed Forces.

Our renewed humanitarian commitment to the people of Vietnam would also provide for the presence of a refugee official at the highest policymaking level in our Saigon Embassy. This man, responsible only to the Ambassador and the President, would be involved in all decisions, whether military or civilian. He would also be a coordinator of the Government and voluntary-agency efforts.

Such experts could enlighten both government and people. Their presence could be the promise of great international efforts, not only in Vietnam, but in all of southeast Asia. For the educational and other programs needed in refugee camps are but a small measure of the needs throughout Vietnam and the neighboring states.

Finally, and most importantly, I do not believe it visionary to consider an international force to assist the developing areas of southeast Asia. The presence of men whose only concern is the health of the population, the education of children, the bringing of simple technologies to remote lands or the development of civilian administrators would be an important defense against future political instability and resultant aggression.

This force of dedicated people would be truly international. It would not be a unilateral American effort. It would enroll the citizens of every country in the free world—but especially the citizens of Asia. These volunteers would bring an emphasis on peace and stability to a part of the world that has known too much war. Their accepted presence in any Asian nation would be symbolic of that nation's desire to improve the conditions under which its people live, regardless of ideology.

Such an international effort could be internationally fostered. There are voluntary agencies established on a worldwide basis to oversee this work and assist in the effort. I recently had the opportunity to address the leaders of these agencies in Geneva about Vietnam. I was taken by their warm response to my suggestions of greater involvement by them and their nations in the civilian effort in Vietnam.

But even more appropriately, a way might be found to involve the one organization of international harmony—the United Nations. For it is this body that can best command the resources, talent and good will among free nations for a concerted development effort.

The work of this force, involving thousands of men and women, would be available to all. Teams of health specialists attacking entire areas suffering from recurrent out-

breaks of disease, public health specialists constructing sanitation and sewage systems, teams of agricultural specialists adapting their knowledge to the differing farm conditions, advising and constructing the necessary equipment and systems needed for efficient food production—all these efforts are within the realm of possibility. Entire school systems could be established; adequate communications with centers of safety and government could be devised and strengthened in methods and procedures for administering to local needs.

Regardless of the conditions in Vietnam in the months ahead, such a proposal expressing our true concern for the people of southeast Asia should be aired before the nations of the world. For what cannot be fully accomplished in the military turmoil of Vietnam immediately can now be undertaken in the more secure nations in that part of the world.

We know that the developed nations in the past have displayed an amazing capability to undertake the infinitely complex tasks of war. Cannot the harnessing of equal energy for these peaceful purposes also be achieved?

To the extent that we leave Vietnam one day with more to mark our presence than destruction, we will have met our true commitment to the Vietnamese. And to the extent that we plan and act now to assure against a recurrence of a Vietnam elsewhere in southeast Asia, we will have met the challenge of the future in Asia.

TOWSON STATE COLLEGE—100 YEARS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, some months ago I had the pleasure of announcing to my colleagues the celebration of the centennial of Towson State College.

Authorized by the Maryland General Assembly in 1865, the school was formally opened in January 1966 as Maryland's first normal school. From a small, single-purpose institution, Towson State College has evolved into a multipurpose college which offers bachelor's degrees in both teacher education and in the arts and sciences.

It is with a great deal of pride, Mr. President, that I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD two newspaper articles which tell the story of the evolution of this great educational institution.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-American, Jan. 9, 1966]

FUTURE OF TOWSON STATE: FIVE TIMES LARGER BY 1975

(By J. William Joynes)

Mail still comes addressed to the Maryland Normal School.

Taxi drivers know where Towson Teachers College is but will tell you they never heard of Towson State.

If this indicates a lasting impression the school leaves, it also indicates the changes which have taken place at the college, which next Saturday will observe its 100th anniversary.

The largest and oldest of Maryland's seven State colleges, exceeded in enrollment only by the University of Maryland, Towson State's three changes in name also describe the changing needs of education and how the century-old college has adapted its program to meet these changing demands.

dramatically illustrated by floods last year in my State and the Midwest, is also emphasized by the adequate flow in the main channel of the Missouri River during the relative dry spell earlier this winter. The water held back and stored in upstream reservoirs during spring and summer rains later was used to good purpose in relieving the subsequent drought.

But much remains to be done. As the Congress studies the President's budget requests for 1967, it is important that we consider all benefits of our water control and utilization programs. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, "Winter Water", by Jim Monroe, of radio station WCMO, Kansas City, Mo., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINTER WATER

Plenty of water in the midst of a winter drought. Dry weather isn't so critical in winter as it can be in the growing season, yet a shortage of winter water causes its own troubles.

Our winter water lies ready for use in the huge reservoirs upstream on the Missouri River. It will not be used to relieve dryness of the land, but gates will be opened on a calculated basis to generate new record amounts of electric power and to maintain the Missouri at a good level to assure downstream users of plenty of intake capacity without the common winter ice jams.

In years past, ice floes were regular problems as they served to cut the flow of water like dams. Dynamite and bombs were used on occasion to break loose the big packs. City water intakes were bogged with mud in the low water. Now, the six upstream reservoirs are at record high levels to provide plenty of winter water downstream. By spring, they will be lowered sufficiently to take care of floodwaters and prevent damage along with maintaining a good navigation level.

The Missouri River is now tamed as far down as Omaha. Plans are developing slowly to control the river farther downstream in Kansas and Missouri. With public support, flood control and its fringe benefits could become one of the outstanding achievements of the century.

THE RESUMPTION OF BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at a time when the President of the United States was nearing a decision with respect to the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, sent a telegram to the President urging the resumption of the bombing of enemy supply lines and installations in North Vietnam. The telegram was sent on behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I should like to bring to the attention of my Senate colleagues this telegram from VFW Commander in Chief Borg, to the President in support of the President's position on the resumption of bombing.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 29, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans comprising the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States I respectfully urge you to order the resumption of bombing of North Vietnamese targets. The VFW believes that the Communist aggressors have had abundant opportunity to indicate a desire for peace through the cessation of their cruel aggression. The Red leadership has responded to your efforts by ridicule and continued terror. The VFW further believes that the winning of the war and the protection of U.S. fighting men requires the bombing of enemy supply lines and installations in North Vietnam. Continuation of the bombing pause will permit the Communists to send more bullets into South Vietnam to kill more U.S. troops and those of our allies. I take this occasion also to pledge you Mr. President the continued support of the VFW for your strong and determined policies to turn back Communist aggression in Vietnam. My recommendations in this telegram are based upon the resolution unanimously adopted by the delegates to our 1965 convention supporting whatever steps are necessary to win in South Vietnam.

Respectfully,

ANDY BORG,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the United States.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, innumerable Federal programs show the commitment of the American people to the health and well-being of our children and young people, as the most important single resource we have. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Project Head Start, Crippled Children's Services, Maternal and Child Health Services, Child Welfare Services, National School Lunch Programs, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and a host of other programs all show the very real concern we have as a Nation for guaranteeing that every child have a fair and equal chance to develop all of his talents and capabilities to the fullest extent possible.

Under the national school lunch program, nourishing and well-balanced lunches were served to 16 million children in 1964, 17 million in 1965, and an estimated 18 million in 1966.

Under the special milk program, children in schools, child-care centers, summer camps, orphanages, and similar institutions were provided with almost 3 billion half-pints of milk in 1964 and 1965, and an estimated 3 billion plus in 1966.

The relationship between hunger and nutrition, and the academic performance of children in school is very clear. Children who have not had an adequate, well-balanced diet, do much less well than others who have.

Now we are faced with the proposal to chop and slash the past levels of the special milk program by nearly 80 percent, from \$103 to \$21 million. This proposal has caused a storm of protest

both here in Washington and in my State of Minnesota, and I think rightly so.

The Minnesota Farmers Union policy statement for 1966 said:

We urge measures to insure good nutrition for everyone * * *. This may be encouraged in several ways; through a nationwide food stamp plan; expanded school lunch and school milk program * * *. The Federal aid for the special milk program should be sufficient so that milk at the "milk breaks" is supplied free to the students.

Mrs. Grace Larson, Bloomington, Minn., said:

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure you would not want to take this away from them.

Mr. V. E. Harris, Twin Ports Co-op Dairy Association, said:

This program is very essential to the farmers of our Nation and even more important to the schoolchildren.

Mrs. Thomas J. Jones, Faribault, Minn., said:

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school.

As if it were not bad enough that 80 percent of these children will no longer have milk, and I think we must be practical in recognizing that the States will be hard pressed to provide the funds necessary to subsidize this milk—as if this were not bad enough, it will be a tremendous blow to our dairy farmers in Minnesota. The return per hour to dairy farmers is now shockingly low—much less than \$1 per hour. This low rate of return caused a sharp drop in Minnesota milk production in 1965, and I think we could expect a further sharp decline with this greatly reduced consumption.

I am heartened that Senators PROXMIRE and HOLLAND have indicated their opposition to this cut, and I intend to oppose it firmly.

I ask unanimous consent that the following letters from Minnesota residents be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Saint Paul, Minn., January 25, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: It was with considerable concern that we read that President Johnson's budget proposed reducing the sum spent on the school milk program to \$37 million for 1967—and, further, that only needy children be allowed to buy milk at reduced cost.

It is our considered judgment that these proposals are false economies to the extreme.

In Saint Paul where we sell milk at 1 cent to students bringing a lunch from home, we are certain that an increase to 4 cents (our cost) would seriously reduce participation among the very students who are most in need of milk at noon from a nutritional standpoint.

In secondary schools, which is our major service in Saint Paul, it is difficult presently to meet the needs of all the underprivileged because such students will go to lengths to avoid being stigmatized as such. We feel certain that such is the case in most secondary schools and only slightly less true in elementary grades.

If the suggested reduction were applied to the school lunch program, it is likely that our lunch charge in Saint Paul would be increased from its present 25 to 30 cents. We feel that such an increase would adversely affect participation among the very students most benefited by the program.

We have worked hard—and have been greatly assisted by State and Federal aids—to increase participation in both the school milk program and the school lunch program. Saint Paul has more than doubled such participation in the past 5 years. We are working to continue this progress.

We urge that you give full consideration to this suggested reduction and work for its reconsideration if you can do so in good conscience.

Cordially,

S. W. DOUCETTE,
Director, Saint Paul School Cafeterias.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Congratulations to you as our Senator from Minnesota.

Are you a supporter of the school lunch program as your predecessor Vice President HUMPHREY is? I sincerely hope you are as I have a request to make of you.

I have worked in the school lunch program for 20 years and am aware of the benefits gained by our children by learning to eat a variety of different foods.

The President's proposed budget included large cuts in the special milk program and the school lunch program. These cuts, if allowed to pass, would mean an increase in price to the children and may well cause some to have to go without a school lunch. My request is that you lend your support to disallow the proposed cuts and keep our school lunch program a vital part of the Nation's economy helping our future citizens grow up strong and healthy.

A friend of yours, Mr. Leroy Johnson, with General Mills, mentioned last week that he too was going to tell you how important it is to support the school lunch program.

Thank you for your consideration to this request.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. DAVID V. JOHNSON.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We are greatly disturbed over President Johnson's proposal to slash the school milk budget. We feel as an average taxpayer some other budget could be considered—why do we always have to consider the needy, they receive plenty already and it is we who pay for it—or the Cuban exiles, who else but us, is paying their transportation costs and so forth, or that highway beautification bill; is that as beneficial as a glass of milk?

Please give due thought to this proposal.

Gratefully

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER REICHEL.

PARIBAUT DAILY NEWS,
Paribault, Minn., January 28, 1966.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Can anything be done to prevent the discontinuance of the penny-a-carton milk plan in our public schools? How can our good Democratic President do this to us? Are there not many other places to cut that would not at the same time cut the health of our children?

As a working mother of seven children, I depend on their getting that penny-a-carton milk twice a day at school. Although our county commissioners declared our Rice County not in need of the poverty funds available, this was an unrealistic decision.

Actually, there is much poverty in Rice County and Paribault. Wages are low here and the cost of living high. Our real estate taxes are \$330.66 per year, * * * my wages \$60 per week for 6 days a week. Unions are almost unheard of here in Paribault except among the most skilled labor.

This letter is written in great haste as I felt I must in some way protest. I realize it is not worded most effectively. What I am trying to say is that this milk cut or increase, depending on how you look at it, is going to be hard on families like my own which do not want to go on welfare, but still need that little boost we have been getting with the school milk program. This is the first time I have vehemently disagreed with the administration, and I am sure that this is going to be a weapon in the hands of the Republicans during the next election. O'mon, now, let's reconsider this decision and urge President Johnson to retain this beneficial milk program just the way it has been.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS J. JONES.

ARROWHEAD COOPERATIVE MILK
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Duluth, Minn., January 21, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: We, members of Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association, want you to do your utmost to restore any moneys that are being cut from the school milk program.

This program is one of the best and should be encouraged more, as it gives "nature's best food," milk, to the group that needs it most. It also, supplies it to some who may not receive it otherwise.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROY E. PETERSON,
Manager, Operator, Arrowhead Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

MENTOR PUBLIC SCHOOL,
Mentor, Minn., January 31, 1966.
The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: After much exposure to all the "title programs, the poverty program and colossal waste that will take place there; to know that the Federal Government is trying to give away money for endless "dreamed up" jobs for youth at \$1.25 per hour—(we know, because we had to dream them up and furnish names of students); then to know vast amounts of foreign aid moneys are given away with no strings attached—and to read about the plans for school lunches in foreign countries at our expense, we superintendents have trouble with our temperatures when we read the enclosed news item.

We have had to deduct 5 percent on each of our monthly lunch reports on the Federal milk program—which seems silly. Recently I received a letter from the State department of education stating that beginning with the February report 10 percent must be deducted. Every time I do this I think how picayunish the Government can be about established and proven programs and how unbelievably loose they can be on such programs as foreign aid.

In light of some of the things mentioned above, isn't it rather ridiculous that the Federal Government should play the lunch program aids so closely? We should be getting more commodities—meat in particular. This year we have received considerably less.

I have always gone along with the Democratic Party but I am beginning to cool quite a bit. Let Congress and/or the executive branch cut the school lunch program and it will be the biggest political mistake they ever made. This is one place where the

money is not wasted on administrative costs. One party might blame the other, but the Democrats are in and must assume the responsibility. It really makes one perturbed to think that a cut in lunch aids was even considered—say nothing about bringing it about.

You will be smart if you work to increase lunch program aids to schools—not to decrease them. Cutting aids would be the biggest joke of the century.

Sincerely yours,

E. P. NEUBAUER,
Superintendent.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

The Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep our youngsters here in the United States well fed at a price that parents can afford.

I would appreciate your efforts in preventing this cut.

Very truly yours,

MURIEL ROSS.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cook in one of our lunch-rooms, in Bloomington. I can see how much good our hot lunch does for our boys and girls. Please see what you can do, so our school lunch and milk money will not be cut.

Sincerely,

ETTA MUNCKE.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE, and HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRs: Please do not cut the appropriation for the school lunch and special milk programs.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEONA JONES.

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,
January 27, 1966.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE and HON. EUGENE MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRs: I am writing to you to ask you to do all that you can to prevent the cut in the appropriations for the school lunch and special milk programs.

If you could see how much good this milk does for some of the children in our schools, I am sure that you would not want to take this away from them. Also, the appropriations that cover the aid for our lunch program. We have children in our school that would be quite hungry in the evening if they were not able to eat here at school. And, if they had to pay more for their lunches, they would not be able to eat the good hot lunches that are prepared. It is important to keep

ment of this Nation's agriculture. In New York State, for example, the appropriations for instructional purposes for Cornell University, the land-grant college in New York State, have been slashed from \$600,000 to \$50,000 for fiscal 1967. Also a cut of over \$387,000—or a cut of over 20 percent—in agriculture research funds for Cornell University and the New York Agricultural Experiment Station at Geneva, N.Y., has been proposed.

Certainly, this country cannot afford such cutbacks in education and research. The research which will be severely curtailed has been instrumental in giving this Nation the cheapest food in the world in terms of the proportion of our incomes used to buy this food. Only 18 percent of our take-home pay is spent for food whereas in Great Britain and France, the figure is almost 30 percent and in Russia, it is nearly 50 percent. This research is also a critical element in this Nation's expanding foreign aid program—food for peace—as we seek to help the newly developing nations of the world to improve their own systems of agricultural production.

This is the most shortsighted kind of economy that I can think of.

I protest as well the effort to cut the gypsy moth program. I would point out that New York State has cooperated fully with the Federal Government in an effort to suppress the gypsy moth and thus prevent it from spreading westward to the Nation's hardwood forests. If this program is even partially abandoned, the insect is likely to pass through New York into the rest of the Nation. The proposed budget cut of 20 percent—or \$261,800—would place an unfair burden on New York State when in fact the rest of the Nation should play a role in eradicating this problem.

I call upon my colleagues to join with me in seeing that each of these very important appropriations are restored to at least the amount appropriated during fiscal 1966.

These are the kinds of programs that I feel Americans, and certainly New Yorkers, would rather pay more taxes to support than to have budget cuts. I strongly protest against them.

RECOGNITION FOR SENATOR RANDOLPH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to extend my warmest congratulations to my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, on the tribute and display of confidence which the Democratic Party of West Virginia has extended to him.

Saturday of last week was the closing filing date for candidates in West Virginia, and he will enter the Democratic primary this spring for reelection to the U.S. Senate unopposed by any other candidate. I believe this regard which West Virginia Democrats have for Senator RANDOLPH is deserved.

As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Committee on Public Works, and through his membership on the Senate Committees on Labor and Public Welfare and Post Office and Civil Service, Senator RANDOLPH has achieved an outstanding record of service to West Virginia and to the country.

For example, his interest in improving public education in the country is well known, as was his role in developing the President's program for highway beautification. These are matters on the Record.

I commend my colleague and wish him continued success in his career of public service.

THE GREAT SOCIETY—THE INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in his recent message to the Congress on the 1967 budget, President Johnson reaffirmed the Nation's determination to push forward with those economic and social programs which are the goals of our Great Society. The Congress, particularly this 89th Congress, has enacted more than a score of programs to improve the quality of life for all Americans, and to break the chain of poverty, ignorance, and lost opportunity which has passed from generation to generation among countless numbers of our people.

We have approved measures to rebuild and revitalize our overcrowded, inefficient, and rapidly growing cities. We have provided the machinery and the authority for increasing economic and social improvement of our rural areas. We have enacted legislation which provides for wise use and conservation of our precious natural resources.

But it must be clearly understood that the goals of the Great Society can be achieved only by their effective implementation at the State and local levels. As the President noted in his budget message, many of our critical new programs involve joint ventures between the Federal Government and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the Nation.

Our Federal system is being tried, as never before, to meet the demands of a rapidly growing population for services which they have a right to expect. This is especially true in highly urbanized areas. State and local governments are finding it increasingly difficult to carry out their responsibilities.

While we know that time and adversity have proved our Federal form of government to be sound, the dynamics of recent changes have created weaknesses in an otherwise durable system—weaknesses which must be corrected if we are to accomplish the goals of the Great Society.

Last year I was privileged to introduce S. 561, a bill designed to improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid and to provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development. Forty Senators joined with me in sponsoring this vital piece of legislation, and you will remember that on August 5, the Senate unanimously approved this proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965. Very briefly, the bill seeks to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government by providing that:

First. Governors will be fully informed of all grants-in-aid to their States, and

that a more uniform, yet flexible, administration of Federal grant funds to the States will be established;

Second. Congress will review new grant programs to insure that such efforts are reassessed at least once in a systematic fashion and reconsidered in light of changing conditions;

Third. Federal departments and agencies will be permitted to render urgently needed technical assistance and training services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis;

Fourth. Grant applications from localities in metropolitan areas shall include the comments of areawide planning bodies, and that general units of local government will be favored as recipients of Federal aid, in contrast to special-purpose districts and authorities; and

Fifth. The General Services Administration, in its acquisition, use, and disposal of urban will, to the extent possible, take into consideration local zoning regulations and development goals.

This proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act constitutes a major step in developing the new machinery required for the federalism of the sixties.

It was gratifying to me, as it must be for all Senators, to hear President Johnson, in his recent budget message, express a special concern for the improvement of intergovernmental relations and an urgent call for final action on S. 561.

Favorable action should be taken on the proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, already before the Congress. This act would improve the administration and facilitate congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid. It would also provide a means for coordinating intergovernmental policy in the administration of grants for urban development.

In effect, the President provided one of the best arguments for early enactment of this omnibus measure when he stated:

The success or failure of * * * (the Great Society) * * * programs depends largely on timely and effective communications and on readiness for action on the part of both Federal agencies in the field and State and local governmental units. We must strengthen the coordination of Federal programs in the field. We must open channels of responsibility. We must give more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. We must help State and local governments to deal more effectively with Federal agencies. We must see that information gets to the field and to cooperating State and local governments, promptly and accurately.

The Senate has already completed action on the measure. It now awaits House action. I strongly urge early consideration and passage of this vitally needed legislation.

COLLEGE STUDENTS SUPPORT U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Nation and the world continue to hope for a secure and peaceful solution in Vietnam. In the Halls of this great Congress, in the United Nations, and in capitols all around the world men and women are grappling with the urgent and challenging task of finding a peaceful solution in southeast Asia and a se-

cure independence for the South Vietnamese people.

Meanwhile, American boys—our greatest natural resource—are hour by hour face-to-face with the fact of armed Communist aggression.

The war we debate here today, our boys are fighting in Vietnam. In campuses all across the country, the call of the draft has begun to weave its way through the dormitories, the student unions, and the classrooms. At the same time, our college students have taken a deep and serious look at the issues of this conflict. Their voice is being raised for all the Nation to hear.

I am proud to say that at the University of Missouri recently over 1,200 students, after considering the critical complexities of Vietnam, signed a petition circulated by the Missouri College Young Democrats in conjunction with the Young Republicans, declaring their full support for the President's policy in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM PETITION

Whereas the American commitment in the Vietnam war has become a major issue on many college campuses.

Whereas some of the most striking dissenters to American policy in Vietnam have been college students.

Whereas these critics seem unrepresentative of the majority of the students at the University of Missouri at Columbia: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the undersigned students of the University of Missouri at Columbia, after consideration of the critical complexities of this issue, affirm our support of President Lyndon B. Johnson and his administration's policy in Vietnam.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Mrs. Esther Peterson, Executive Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, has officially informed me of the resolution passed by the Consumer Advisory Council, January 14, 1966, calling for prompt congressional enactment of fair packaging and truth-in-lending legislation as requested by the President in his state of the Union message, as well as enactment of improvements in the food, drug, and cosmetic acts.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL, JANUARY 14, 1966

Whereas President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, has called for action "to prevent the deception of the American consumer—requiring all packages to state clearly and truthfully their contents—all interest and credit charges to be fully revealed—and keeping harmful drugs and cosmetics away from our stores"; and

Whereas President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, has indicated his intent to propose legislation "to seek an end

to the mounting tragedy of destruction on our highways"; and

Whereas the Consumer Advisory Council, on a number of occasions, has strongly urged enactment of fair packaging and truth-in-lending legislation, the omnibus food and drug amendments called for in the President's Message on Consumer Interests of 1964, and legislation promoting automobile safety; and

Whereas consumers have a vital interest in seeing that prices are kept down: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Consumer Advisory Council, That the Congress promptly enact fair packaging and truth-in-lending legislation as requested by the President in his state of the Union message, thus improving the ability of the consumer to choose the best buy and to exert a strong influence in holding down the price line; be it further

Resolved, That Congress buttress the consumer's right to safety by swiftly enacting the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act improvements called for in President Johnson's state of the Union message; be it further

Resolved, That Congress act favorably on legislation to assure minimum tire safety standards and legislation to require new cars to incorporate other prescribed safety features.

NEW MEXICO PUBLISHER BEATS THE BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the February 11, 1966, issue of Time magazine, in its "Press" section, carries an article that I commend to my colleagues' attention.

The article deals with the courageous legal battle carried out by the publisher of the Southwesterner, Mr. Bill McGaw, after a member of the John Birch Society attempted to organize an advertising boycott to stifle his criticism of the Birchers.

It gives me particular pleasure to tell you that the story has a happy ending. In the face of the massed legal and propaganda talent of the Birch Society, my friend Mr. McGaw won his case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of this excellent article appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDITORS: SHOWDOWN IN THE SOUTHWEST

The litigious reader ready to sue a newspaper for libel at the drop of an insult has become a familiar courtroom character. But this time the roles were reversed. The editor was suing one of his readers. And to add to the novelty, the editor won. Bill McGaw, owner, editor, publisher, and principal reporter of the Southwesterner, claimed that his monthly journal of Western lore had been damaged by the actions of Alamogordo, N. Mex., Furniture Dealer A. A. Webster, Jr., a member of the John Birch Society. And a jury agreed—to the amount of \$20,000.

A tough-talking hombre with a shock of silver-white hair and a mustache to match, Bill McGaw, 51, does not usually concern himself with current events. He likes to roam the West, tracking down such legends as the saga of the one-woman bawdyhouse in Columbus, N. Mex. Along the way he collects Western relics, including the stagecoach that may have carried President Polk to his inauguration. In July 1963 he learned that the New Mexico Press Association had held a dinner in honor of defeated California Congressman John Rousselot, who is presently the public relations director of the John

Birch Society. McGaw suddenly got excited about current events.

POISONED SPRINGS

"What the hell is the matter with the newspaper editors of this State?" he asked in an editorial. "The very guardians of our intellectual outposts, the very men who should be sounding the warning against radicalism, import this poison to our springs and beg us to sit and sup with them. Birchites and Communists are probably bent upon the same goals, the main one of which is the destruction of confidence in our Government. I, too, consider myself a conservative. I stand for the old-fashioned principles of this country and will fight for them, but that doesn't include harboring Birchites or Communists or any other half-baked radicals, fanatics and seditionists."

If Rousselot read the attack, he ignored it. But Furniture Dealer Webster was outraged. He circulated a letter to McGaw's advertisers: "I ask if you, as a pro-American, anti-Communist businessman, plan to support a newspaper which is evidently following the Communist Party line?" In answer, some 13 advertisers pulled out of the Southwesterner; the newspaper, which had lost \$2,500 the previous year, lost an additional \$1,400.

McGaw filed suit in Federal court, asking for \$1,800,000 from the Birch Society; in State court, he demanded the same sum from Webster. Once the Birch Society won a court order protecting the secrecy of its membership lists, McGaw was unable to prove that Webster was the society's legal agent, and he was forced to withdraw his Federal suit. When that happened, the Birch Society, which had filed a countersuit against McGaw, also called off its lawyers. Had the Birch Society gone into court as a plaintiff, it would have faced the difficult task of proving that it had suffered damages from McGaw's editorial. More important, it could have been forced to produce the same membership lists that it was so anxious to keep under wraps.

A REPORT THAT BACKFIRED

In State court, where he sued Webster instead of the Birch Society, the angry editor fared better. The defense tried the classic libel defense of truth. McGaw's editorial, the lawyers said, followed the Communist line, just as Webster had charged. Appearing as a star witness, far-right Commentator Dan Smoot agreed that the editorial was Communist lining, and the same point was made in a deposition from Martin Dies, onetime chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. But then the defense quoted some words of praise for the John Birch Society from a California Senate subcommittee on un-American activities. Once that report had been introduced as evidence, the tactic backfired. McGaw's attorneys were able to read parts that the defense lawyers had ignored, sections that compared the Birch Society to the Communist Party, just as McGaw had done. After that, the jury was convinced.

Throughout the trial, the courtroom was packed with spectators openly sympathetic to Webster. Some of them may have kept busy after hours as well. McGaw received obscene telephone calls at his hotel. "They were so vile," he recalls, "that I couldn't repeat them to a marine drill sergeant—and my own language is pretty salty." Victory should help him bear up under the insults. But it may be some time before McGaw can collect his \$20,000. Last week Webster announced his intention of appealing the decision.

MANY BENEFITS FROM FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the importance of flood control projects, so

February 8, 1966

The subcommittee invites all interested persons to attend.

Contributing to the population discussion Wednesday will be Dean William E. Moran, Jr., Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, who is president of the Catholic Association for International Peace. Dean Moran will raise new questions for which answers must be found.

Joining him tomorrow are two Protestant lay spokesmen: Mrs. Theodore F. Wallace, of Shawnee Mission, Kans., a vice president of the National Council of Churches of Christ, and Mr. James MacCracken, New York City, the executive director of Church World Service. Mr. MacCracken directs the work of an organization responsible for the feeding of many millions of hungry people in many parts of our world.

How do we raise enough food to feed the multiplying millions?

The subcommittee has asked Dr. Raymond Ewell, Buffalo, N.Y., vice president for research of the State University of New York in Buffalo to address his remarks to the problems of food supply and food distribution. Dr. Ewell is a professor of chemistry and chemical engineering. He is consultant on research to AID, and consultant on the fertilizer industry for the Government of India and for the United Nations. Dr. Ewell has recently returned from one of his many trips to India and he has also traveled extensively throughout the Soviet Union.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gilbert S. Merritt, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney, middle district of Tennessee, term of 4 years, vice Kenneth Harwell, resigned.

Anthony J. Furka, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Pennsylvania, term of 4 years, vice James R. Berry, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, February 15, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site;

H.R. 4665. An act relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining;

H.R. 6125. An act to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 9273. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House documents of certain proceedings;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel;

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care;

H.R. 11748. An act to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care;

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans loan programs; and

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2600. An act to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4665. An act relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining;

H.R. 10185. An act amending certain estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H.R. 11006. An act to extend the statutory burial allowance to certain veterans whose deaths occur as a result of a service-connected disability;

H.R. 11007. An act to provide statutory authority for the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to assume the duties of Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator, or during a vacancy in that office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11747. An act to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6125. An act to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; and

H.R. 9273. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House

documents of certain proceedings; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 11631. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration with respect to the training and education of health service personnel; and

H.R. 11748. An act to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 11927. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to permit deduction by brokers of certain costs and expenses from rental collections on properties acquired under the veterans' loan programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at the grave of Capt. William Driver in Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statistical information in right-to-work States and non-right-to-work States.

By Mr. METCALF:

Article entitled "Interstate 87—Will It Destroy Open Space or Conserve and Save County's Needs?", printed in the Westchester County (N.Y.) Reporter-Dispatch.

Editorial entitled "A Treasure Worth Conserving," dealing with the effort to preserve oil shale deposits.

L.B.J.'S GREAT RECORD IN MEETING PEACE DEMANDS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the United States has met more than 90 percent of the 12 demands on Vietnam policy made by the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy in November.

On November 27, Sane organized the biggest peace march ever held in Washington—more than 20,000 persons. It is announced aim was not to force the United States to unilaterally withdraw from Vietnam but to negotiate the issue.

One of the major demands was that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam. A pause was ordered and maintained for 37 days.

Sane asked the United States to state the conditions under which it would negotiate. The answer for months has been without preconditions or restrictions.

Sane asked for an American call for a cease-fire. The United States has called for a cease-fire.

Sane urged U.S. support for the Geneva Accords of 1954. Such support has been stated many times.

Sane wanted a U.S. declaration favoring the withdrawal of all foreign military forces from South Vietnam. This has been a frequently stated goal of U.S. policy.

Sane asked the United States to state its support for free elections in Vietnam. This it has done.

Sane urged U.S. support for "peaceful" reunification of Vietnam. American policy backs this plan if an elected South Vietnamese Government wants reunification.

Other demands with which U.S. policy is in agreement include U.S. support for United Nations initiative on Vietnam, in-

clusion of the Vietcong in peace talks—as members of the Hanoi delegation—and willingness to "de-escalate" the war if the other side will also.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the Sane demands and the U.S. position be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SANE DEMAND

1. United States stop bombing North Vietnam.
2. United States call for a cease-fire.
3. United States state conditions under which it will accept peace.
4. United States again support Geneva accords.
5. United States favor eventual withdrawal of all foreign military forces.
6. United States favor Vietnam free elections.
7. United States support prohibition of military alliances.
8. United States favor peaceful reunification of Vietnam.
9. United States agree to constitution of representative government in South Vietnam.
10. United States support U.N. supervision of cease-fire and U.N. provision for establishing new government in South Vietnam.
11. United States halt introduction of men and materiel and ask other side to do same.
12. United States negotiate with all parties including Vietcong.

U.S. POSITION

United States did so for more than a month.

United States has called for a cease-fire. United States says it will discuss peace without any preconditions or restrictions. United States has done so.

United States favors such withdrawal.

United States does favor this.

United States indicates it will if after election the South Vietnamese Government so desires.

United States favors reunification if elected South Vietnamese Government wishes reunification.

United States favors this if elected South Vietnamese Government does.

The President welcomes any U.N. initiative. On January 31, I.B.J. announced we are taking the Vietnam issue to the U.N.

United States welcomes such deescalation. A unilateral halt would mean U.S. surrender. The President has said Vietcong could be represented at conference table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the administration's stand on Sane's demands, while not announced specifically as such, actually agree with more than 90 percent of this outstanding organization.

Where does North Vietnam stand on these issues? By any standard of measurement Hanoi's score would be near zero.

Peace is what the President is trying with all his heart to achieve; and I think he is doing well, considering the cruel and tragic circumstances.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SUPPORTED SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in view of the Budget Bureau's recent decision to withhold moneys already appropriated from the special milk program for schoolchildren I believe that it is appropriate to take a look at the late President Kennedy's position on this vital program.

In a speech made before a milk and nutrition conference in 1962 President Kennedy put it this way:

"There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead."

Mr. President, as a result of the Budget Bureau's false economy move less and less children will be receiving school milk in the days ahead. The Bureau's slice of \$3 million of appropriated funds from

the program has resulted in a 10-percent cutback in the Federal reimbursement rates. As a result the children themselves in many instances will have to pay more. Some children, especially those from low-income families—the ones who need the milk most—will drop out of the program.

Of course the Department of Agriculture's plans for next year are even more destructive of the intent of the program as spelled out by President Kennedy. The budget would be cut from \$103 to \$21 million and a means test would be used to make sure that the milk goes only to the neediest. In informal discussions the Department has indicated that they feel only one-fifth to one-sixth of the children participating in the school milk program would stop drinking milk if the Federal share were eliminated in all but poverty cases. I think this estimate is far too low. But even if it is correct it means that millions of our Nation's schoolchildren will drop out of the school milk program if it is modified.

JAVITS OPPOSES PROPOSED AGRICULTURE BUDGET CUTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make these remarks to take exception to various budget cuts proposed by the administration in agriculture. Perhaps the most startling of these is the proposed cut for the school milk program.

The Federal Government during fiscal 1966 is spending \$100 million to subsidize more than 3 billion half-pint bottles of milk for schoolchildren. The new budget proposes to cut this amount by

79 percent—down to a meager \$21 million.

I was concerned earlier this year when the Budget Bureau held back \$3 million from the funds already appropriated for the school milk program. But now the administration has decided that this program must suffer so that some of the President's other proposals—some of which are new and unproven—can be undertaken. I believe that the school milk program is one which has proven over the years to be most effective. I feel this country can afford to see that its future generation is given the proper nutritional development. I see no need to reduce this program which has cost relatively little and done so much so that we may grope our way into new programs where the results are uncertain.

Another aspect of this cut in the school milk program would likely be its deleterious effect upon the milk producers across the Nation. While at the moment, there exists a relatively stable balance between the amount of milk produced and commercial demand, milk has historically been produced in greater quantities in the spring and summer than in the fall and winter. So it seems we cannot write off the possibility of increased surpluses in the near future. Any statement to the contrary appears to me to be premature optimism.

The present subsidy payment of the U.S. Government is approximately 3 cents for a half pint. If the milk is regularly sold for 6 cents then the cost to the schoolchildren is only 3 cents. Thus, if there is no subsidy, the cost for the child will double. This few cents may seem very insignificant but to some it may be the determining factor to a child in selecting something other than milk—something perhaps with a lower nutritional value or it is even possible a child might have no milk at all because of the lack of a few additional cents. The unit costs of this subsidy program are very small and benefits certainly very great. It must be maintained at the very least—undiminished.

I take exception as well to the proposed cut of \$320,000 from the funds allotted for the joint Federal-State fight against the golden nematode—an insect which has the capability of destroying the entire Long Island potato crop. The destruction of the potato crop could result in the loss to the economy of New York State of over \$25 million annually. The proposed nematode control fund cut from \$425,000 to \$105,000—more than 75 percent—comes at a time when the combined Federal-State investment of some \$8 million over a 20-year period is nearing its goal. I am informed that there is a good possibility of almost complete containment of this infestation within the next 3 or 4 years. It is unthinkable to me that the Federal Government should withdraw its financial support and personnel when the success of its efforts is so close to fruition.

I note that the administration has alarmingly reduced the land-grant college program. The Federal land-grant college program has for over a century provided this Nation with trained teachers and engineers who have made significant contributions to the develop-

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for duty free treatment for certain forms of copper imported into the United States. This legislation is strongly recommended by the administration.

The shortage of copper and the difficulties which such shortage is imposing on domestic users of various forms of copper and copper products is well known. In behalf of my constituents who have communicated with me on this subject, I intend to urge early consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means of this important legislation.

POST-KOREAN GI BILL

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to have the privilege of cosponsoring and voting for the new GI bill, which will provide a permanent system of educational and other benefits of veterans of service in our Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. I have always supported renewal of such essential readjustment assistance, and I am delighted that at long last the House has acted on the legislation so carefully developed by the able chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Representative OLIN TEAGUE.

In the 10 years since the Korean GI bill ended, young Americans have had their lives disrupted to face danger throughout the world in defense of democracy. And today, sadly, we can no longer call this legislation the cold war GI bill, for gallant young men are giving their lives for us in Vietnam. But whether it was across the Atlantic in Berlin or Lebanon, or across the Pacific in Vietnam, all who served us so well deserve the opportunity for further education or training, our aid in buying homes for their families, and in obtaining necessary medical care.

Differences in the House and Senate bills must now be resolved. But I am confident that the final version agreed upon will provide the basic assistance so merited by those who are called upon to carry such a disproportionate burden of citizenship.

I would emphasize that this legislation is not a matter of rewarding our service veterans. It is a matter of right, a way to render justice and equity in compensating them for lost time and opportunities by assistance to begin again civilian life on an equal standing with those not called upon to serve. It is also in our national interest that as many as possible of our citizens be trained to fill productive roles in our increasingly complex and technological society.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to the thousands of young Americans whose civilian lives have been interrupted to guard the Nation's security. And we owe more than can ever be repaid to the men who now risk their lives each day in the bitter Vietnam conflict.

I urge Congress to act now with speed in giving final approval to this most meritorious and long overdue measure.

SUPPORT OF VIETNAM POLICIES

(Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reaffirm my undivided support for the Vietnamese policy conducted by President Johnson and to note that in a poll of my constituents in New Jersey's Second District, the support for his conduct of our effort on behalf of South Vietnamese defense against Communist aggression received a great majority of approval.

In December, I spent the Christmas holidays in South Vietnam, visiting Army, Marine and Air Force installations ashore and vessels of the 7th Fleet steaming in the South China Sea, and there I not only saw for myself the value of our present course, but saw the support these policies have among our fighting men, both commissioned and enlisted, in all branches of the service.

Also, while in Vietnam, I discussed both the military and civil programs on which our Government is embarked and plans for future expansion of our wide variety of civil action programs in South Vietnam with United States diplomats and operations mission spokesmen. I returned more convinced than ever that if we are to achieve an end to the fighting in southeast Asia, we must convince the Communists by military means that we are there to stay; that we will not permit tyranny to achieve what democratic procedures reject, and that our determination is unshakable.

I am also convinced that we have a caliber of men in our Armed Forces superior in training and equipment to those who fought in the two wars in which I served. I cannot speak highly enough of the young men who are serving in all branches of our military forces. Their understanding of their mission and their support of their Government's policies exceeds anything I encountered in World War II and the Korean fighting. From General Westmoreland to Lt. Col. Jim Kelley, 7th Marines regimental commander at Chu Lai, I was told by our commanding officers that the young officers and enlisted men serving under them in Vietnam are better troops than were the servicemen of one and two generations ago. They explained this phenomenon by pointing out that these younger men are educated better than ever. This tribute is a fine testimonial to America's leaders of the past quarter-century, of both major political faiths, whose domestic programs in the realms of health, education, and welfare have proven their worth.

It was most impressive to converse with many South Vietnamese, not only in Saigon, where there is perhaps more awareness of the widespread implications of the war, but throughout the countryside where political implications are easily lost in the day-to-day contact with the Vietcong. I found without exception

that every Vietnamese not only welcomed the American presence there, but hoped our military forces and our aid missions would remain until democracy achieves permanence in their country.

Mr. Speaker, we mailed approximately 100,000 questionnaires dealing with our Vietnamese policy, 1 questionnaire going into the home of each registered voter in the Second Congressional District of New Jersey. To date, we have tabulated 4,200 replies. The questionnaire and the present results follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No
1. Do you agree with our present policy in Vietnam?-----	69	31
2. If you were President of the United States, would you:		
A. Continue our present Vietnam policy?-----	67	33
B. Intensify our military efforts in Vietnam?-----	79	21
C. Pull our troops out of Vietnam?-----	31	69
D. Follow another course (please specify)?-----	20	--

Of the 575 persons who stated they would follow another course—48 percent advocated using nuclear or conventional bombs to blast North Vietnam; 20 percent suggested placing the matter in the hands of the United Nations and/or urging other friendly nations to supply troops; 14 percent urged that North Vietnamese ports be blockaded; 12 percent called for intensified diplomatic efforts to obtain negotiations; 3 percent wished for winning the war through increased aid to South Vietnam; 3 percent urged that we change our military tactics to guerrilla-type warfare.

Replies to this poll are still arriving with every mail delivery, but it is already obvious to me that in New Jersey's Second District, the majority of the residents are also in favor of what I consider the President's wise and correct decisions. This is the time for all Americans, regardless of party, to unite behind the President and support our southeast Asian policy. I am happy to report from personal knowledge that in New Jersey's Second District, this unification and support is obvious.

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GIBBONS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE JOB CORPS

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two of my colleagues [Mr. GOODALL and Mr. QUIE], who described themselves as friends of the Job Corps concept, took one small incident, distorted it, and then proceeded to unfairly accuse the Job Corps of following a philosophy which endangers the program and of advocating the law of the jungle.

My colleagues failed to recognize the great work which is going on in the 90 Job Corps centers now in operation; they

failed to recognize the great number of needy youth who are benefiting from the program.

They declared that Job Corps administrators advocate lawlessness; that they are soft on criminality. Obviously, they do not take into account the hard work being done day and night to instill good citizenship into these youngsters, the wonderful self-government being performed in the centers by the enrollees—youth who had little or no use for any kind of government before.

They deplored the lack of cooperation by Job Corps officials with law enforcement officials on the basis of their erroneous information; they failed to tell of the constant and close cooperation which occurs constantly between Job Corps and local officials.

Mr. GOODELL and Mr. QUIE took as their text the case of a corpsman in the Mountain Home Job Corps Conservation Center in Idaho. They obviously did not check their story before loosing it on the House of Representatives and on the Nation's press.

If they had, they would not have wandered as far afield.

As the distinguished Member from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], said yesterday:

I was fully informed from the first and joined in making certain a full investigation was conducted.

That full information was available to everyone—including the gentlemen who chose to speak yesterday without recourse to the facts. Indeed, Mr. WHITE invited Messrs. QUIE and GOODELL to visit the great State of Idaho and its Job Corps camps. He had reason, indeed, to call these charges "inaccurate, misleading, politically motivated and designed to undermine the antipoverty program in Idaho."

Let us look at the case of Paul Dennis Jones, as any fair-minded person might.

MESSRS. GOODELL and QUIE said that on November 15, Jones brutally beat a fellow corpsman, slashed his face and hands with a knife and then stabbed him in the abdomen. The incident did occur on November 15. Jones did slash another corpsman. The injured corpsman required a few stitches but was not hospitalized. The incident, like any other assault, is deplorable and Job Corps officials in the centers and in Washington strive constantly to reduce such happenings—but it was hardly a brutal beating.

They point out that Jones was a parole violator from California and had three felony convictions at the time he entered Job Corps. Had Job Corps known this at the time of his application, he would never have been allowed in the program.

But the California State Employment Service, which screened Jones, failed to turn up any criminal record—which occurred in a different county—and recommended him for acceptance in Job Corps.

Job Corps depends on its local screening agencies to check the backgrounds of applicants, and these agencies do the best they can. There is no national file of parolees or juvenile offenders; and there is no way, except for a prohibitively cost-

ly security check, in which every facet of an applicant's life can be checked. Neither the screening agency nor Job Corps can be faulted for facts unavailable to them.

Jones came to Mountain Home and soon exhibited qualities of leadership, which led to his being named a dormitory leader. It was not known to the center, to Job Corps, or to the California State Employment Service that Jones had a record until after he had been sentenced to an Idaho prison for the assault.

MESSRS. GOODELL and QUIE said Job Corps violated the Interstate Compact on Parole and Probation by failing to notify Idaho authorities that Jones was a parolee. First of all, Job Corps did not know he was a parolee; second, if they had, it is not the responsibility of Job Corps to notify a State about the presence of a parolee unless the State had been required to provide supervision. This is a compact between the States. The Federal Government and its agencies are not a party to it.

My colleagues declared that the center and Job Corps refused to let Idaho authorities know how many corpsmen are presently on parole or on probation from other States.

The truth of the matter is that the center director quite properly refused to allow Idaho parole officials to enter the center to interrogate each corpsman to find out this information. This would have been a gross invasion of the privacy of the corpsmen. Any pertinent information can be obtained if requested properly.

My colleagues said Job Corps paid for an attorney, bail, and psychiatric treatment for Jones. Again, facts have been ignored. Job Corps provides legal counsel for every enrollee who needs it. This policy is in keeping with the Supreme Court decision and the law of the land. And, the involved corpsman pays for part of this legal service.

No bail ever was provided Jones, because he did not have enough money in his readjustment allowance to cover the cost of a bail bond. Corpsmen pay for their bail; not Job Corps. Jones' defense counsel asked for a psychiatric examination as part of the defense and this was provided.

My colleagues obviously avoided checking their information when they declared Job Corps, by telegram from Washington, asked the court to release Jones on probation and let him return to the center.

The truth of the matter is that the court approached the center director, asking if Job Corps would accept Jones and provide needed psychiatric treatment if the judge were to put him on probation. The center director queried Job Corps headquarters. In its continuing effort to cooperate, Job Corps headquarters agreed to do this—and even at this time, mind you, Jones' criminal record still was not known.

Job Corps sent a teletype message to the center director—nearly every center has a teletype for quick communications—and this teletype message was shown the court.

My Republican colleagues said Job Corps did not file a complaint against Jones; the center director personally delivered the young man to the police and never was asked to sign a complaint. The local prosecuting attorney was given every assistance. The center director was ready to make any witnesses available to the prosecution, but was never asked to do so and the prosecution followed the normal channel of issuing subpoenas. The center director appeared in court even though he was not asked to appear, nor was he subpoenaed.

My colleagues make much of the meeting of Idaho officials, which decided to write to Mr. Shriver, from whom they claim not to have received a reply. The Idaho group received a reply from Job Corps officials who were acquainted with and involved in the matter.

Erroneously, my colleagues indicate the judge gave Jones 4 months in jail and 2 years probation on the pleading of Job Corps officials. Job Corps entered no plea for Jones; Job Corps was not a party to the action.

What would my colleagues have Job Corps officials do?

They turned over the assailant to the law enforcement authorities; they cooperated with the law enforcement agencies to the fullest extent; they stand ready to cooperate in any agreement reached by the States in the final disposition of the case.

The situation now is one in which the States of Idaho and California must come to some agreement. Idaho has notified California of the presence of one of its parole violators. It is up to the two States to work out the solution—Job Corps and the Federal Government are not a party to the interstate compact.

It is unfortunate that Messrs. GOODELL and QUIE should make such irresponsible charges that the Mountain Home case indicates to enrollees that the law of the jungle pays off and that—and I quote—"even officials of the U.S. Government countenance assault with a deadly weapon."

This is not true in this case, nor in any other case of law violation in Job Corps.

MESSRS. QUIE and GOODELL say the case points up two flaws in the program—the screening of applicants and the philosophy of Job Corps administrators.

The screening of applicants is a difficult job and the procedures constantly are tightened for the benefit of the youth to be served and the program in general. The screeners, by and large, are doing a good job.

The other alleged flaw is the so-called soft and confused Job Corps philosophy. This is untrue, as many law enforcement officials can attest. Job Corps officials everywhere cooperate fully with the law to punish wrongdoers and to protect the innocent. As a matter of fact, there have been dozens of cases where the court has failed to sentence a wrongdoer and the Job Corps has been more strict—they have discharged such youth from the program.

I would suggest to my colleagues that if they really are friends of the program

average underevaluation during the 3-year period of 1962-64 was approximately 22 percent, according to the same source.

Some of our imports, notably those from Canada and Mexico do not incur such heavy charges. Other imports come from still greater distances than those from the United Kingdom and Japan, such as those from some Asiatic, African and Australian sources. Altogether some 80 percent of our total imports come from overseas areas and incur rather heavy shipping charges. It has been calculated that a global average of 17½ percent would not be an excessive margin of enhancement to bring our official statistics into line with those recorded and published by nearly all other countries with respect to their imports.

If we apply this global percentage to our imports we find them coming much nearer to our export levels. In 1964 our import bill instead of being \$18.6 billion would have been \$3.25 billion higher, or \$21.8 billion. The supposed surplus of nearly \$7 billion would thus have been cut almost in half.

Admittedly this error of computation does not change our balance of payments even if it changes our balance of trade. Nevertheless, it produces an incorrect picture of our competitive prowess in world markets, and possibly influences our trade policy. Beyond that it has a bearing on our broader foreign economic policy. To appreciate this influence we have but to remark that instead of enjoying an export surplus in our trade with Japan, this country has been running a deficit in recent years. Yet, the supposed surplus has been used as evidence of our restrictive trade policy. I daresay that the public believes that we have been buying less from Japan than we have been selling them. The same holds true with a minor exception, in our trade with England.

These erroneous impressions have been used as weapons to encourage us to liberalize our trade policy and to move toward free trade more rapidly, although we have come about 80 percent of the way toward free trade under the tariff-cutting program.

The other error that has been promulgated without any visible effort by the Government to correct it, has been to include in our exports under our foreign aid program no less than food-for-peace shipments and our subsidized shipments of wheat, cotton, and other farm exports, in our export totals.

To this there need be no objection but for the temptation to lump together all exports and then point to the handsome surplus as evidence of our competitive muscle and to conclude that further tariff reductions are in order. That temptation, to say the least, has been but lightly resisted. Yet, if these various exports—exports that would not be made on a private commercial competitive basis—were not included in our export figures, the total export figures would be seriously deflated. If our exports are to be used as evidence of our competitive standing in foreign markets,

the subsidized and often gift shipments should, of course, not be included.

Studies show that in 1964 our exports under various nonmilitary governmental programs, including subsidized products, amounted to \$3.7 billion. Added to the error already described, the total rises to nearly \$7 billion, or enough to wipe out completely the alleged surplus.

Meantime, since 1958 we have been recording a deficit in the shipping costs incident to moving our exports and imports. In 1963 this reached the level of \$300 million.

This record offers little as evidence of the competitive vigor of this country. The fact is that in our competitive struggle with the other leading trading nations, we have been lagging badly since 1958. This lag is especially notable in manufactured goods, with the one exception of machinery. While chemical exports have done well, they have consisted in great part of raw or processed materials. On the other hand, our imports during the past decade have moved heavily toward manufactured goods.

The upshot is that in a score of important industries we have been losing out in the export field. An outstanding example has been the steel industry. Another is finished automobiles. Other examples are typewriters, sewing machines, various items of hardware, shoes, cotton textiles, watches, and so forth. Yet, not many years ago we were the world's leaders in the exportation of most of these items. Specifically, in 1962 we experienced a deficit—even by the official basis of computation—of \$4.6 billion in our foreign trade in petroleum, nonferrous metals—copper, lead, zinc, and so forth—and paper and paper products, and a host of others. Even if the items mentioned are excluded, the deficit was \$2.1 billion. This included a long list of products, among them cotton and wool textiles, wood manufactures, beverages, meats, fishery products, toys, athletic goods, jewelry, leather and rubber goods, and so forth.

In my own district, hardwood plywood imports have taken their toll, and imports of manmade fibers continue to increase year after year, outpacing the increase in our exports.

Our foreign trade is not on a healthy trend and no amount of official selling efforts by Government agencies will change the basic trouble. Our disadvantage lies in costs. Our labor costs are higher in nearly all instances than abroad, and the fast-rising technological advancement in other industrial countries dims the outlook for closing the gap. Our high wages provide our public purchasing power; so it is not a matter of reducing wages. Nevertheless the pressure to remain or to become competitive exerts a strong pressure to reduce costs by automating, modernizing, etc. This pressure falls on the work force, not as reduced wages but as jobs that are abolished or jobs that do not open.

In response to the noncompetitive position of so many of our industries, scores upon scores of U.S.-owned plants have been opened abroad or their existing foreign operations enlarged. For the future

this does not spell more lively export markets. Our capital, now continuing to install American machinery abroad in foreign plants, will serve more markets from within. Even our parts shipments will decline as other countries raise their requirements for the portion of parts that must be manufactured in the home country, as they now are doing in country after country.

The escape hatch of foreign investment is not open to small industry, lacking the necessary reserves; to suppliers of parts and components to mass producers; nor to farmers, except on the borders or the near islands in the Caribbean, and not to labor unless it wishes to emigrate. These are the people who are left holding the bag.

The steps now proposed to overcome the balance-of-payments deficit will fall short of what is needed. We need a re-orientation of our foreign economic policy, taking its cue from the basic fact revealed by the new studies; namely, that we are in a weaker competitive position in the world than we had believed, and that we must recognize this fact and act accordingly.

Obviously, further sharp tariff reductions as contemplated under the Kennedy round cannot be justified. Scores of our industries are already overexposed and no further exposure should be risked. To do so could create a crisis in our balance of payments that will call for ever greater governmental interference and control of private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with other Members in the introduction of a joint resolution designed to correct the error of statistical reporting that I have described.

HONOLULU CONFERENCE EXCLUDED ALLIES

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to President Johnson urging him to call another Vietnam strategy conference and this time invite the chiefs of state of Australia, South Korea, and others like the Philippines from whom we seek increased support in the war effort.

This action would help to repair the damage caused by the exclusion of Australia and South Korea from the Honolulu conference and might lead to the support which Secretary of State Rusk recently sought from NATO nations.

Australia and South Korea have combat troops in South Vietnam, but the Honolulu conference structure gave the appearance that the only nations whose combat contributions deserved recognition were the United States and South Vietnam.

Sunday night I had sent a telegram to the President in Honolulu, urging that Australia and South Korea be invited. The text of my telegram follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1966.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I take the liberty to transmit the suggestion that you invite the chiefs of state of Australia and South

dedication of the third building used by his congregation, the Euclid Avenue Temple.

In 1907, Anshe Chesed called to its pulpit, Rabbi Louis Wolsey, who served for 18 years, leaving in 1925 to answer a call to serve as rabbi for the Rodeph Sholem congregation in Philadelphia. Following the lead begun by Rabbi Machol, the new rabbi vigorously pressed for the building of a larger temple.

The new building on Euclid Avenue, at 82d Street, was dedicated on March 22, 1912. It was hailed as one of the most handsome sanctuaries in the country. One observer described the temple as follows: "The building is alive with color, free from the artificiality of smooth brick work; the colors and the roughness harmonize with nature's kaleidoscope appearance. The very irregularities of color, joints, lines and mortars liberate the building from any impression of mechanical effect. Being of rough brick, dirt and dust cannot settle upon it for the rain washes it away."

"This great event in the religious life of the city of Cleveland was hailed in a prophetic editorial which appeared in the March 15, 1912 issue of the Jewish Independent: "After tomorrow, old Scovill Temple, which has done such a valiant service for Cleveland Judaism will be memory only. It was the Eagle Street Shul first, then the Scovill Temple, and on the evening of March 22 it will be the Euclid Avenue Temple. Will the Euclid Avenue Temple be too far downtown in 25 years?"

Answer: Cleveland expanded so rapidly that the temple was too far downtown 15 years after its construction.

Large though the temple was, it did not provide enough space for the growing religious school. By dint of continuous persuasion, Rabbi Wolsey succeeded in winning the congregation over to the task of constructing an annex. This task was consummated in 1923, when the temple house adjoining the temple and matching it in design, was completed.

The modern era and the period of its greatest growth began for Anshe Chesed congregation with the advent in September 1923 of its rabbi, Dr. Barnett Robert Brickner. Rabbi Brickner's ministry encompassed a never-ending series of innovations, achievements, and activities which resulted in added luster for the temple, locally and nationally.

Rabbi Brickner's religious philosophy as it manifested itself in his policies, was that liberal Judaism must be amenable to change and adjustment, whether it be by innovation or restoration.

Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld succeeded the late Rabbi Brickner in October 1958. A native of New York City, Dr. Lelyveld is a distinguished scholar and author with an impressive record of service as executive, board member, and officer of many national organizations. He was general chairman of the 1963 Cleveland Jewish Welfare Fund Campaign and is presently a member of the board of trustees of the Jewish Community Federation and its executive committee, cochairman of the emergency committee of the Clergy for Civil Rights, and, the executive committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Cleveland chapter.

Stimulated by the energetic zeal of their rabbi, the Anshe Chesed members have helped him create a vital kind of Judaism. Alive to their responsibilities toward an expanded service to their fellowmen, the members have joined with their rabbi in enterprise after enterprise to deepen their understanding of their faith and to convey the Jewish heritage to their children. This spirit of experimentation, characterized by a willingness to change, modify and re-appraise has caused the Fairmount Temple to be called the "laboratory temple."

At the end of a century and a decade, Anshe Chesed, in its fifth home, Fairmount

Temple, built at a cost of \$2,500,000 is reckoned as one of the principal bulwarks of Judaism in the Nation. Many of the members have spanned, in their lifetimes, the major portion of the congregation's history, and are still as loyal to its ideals as they were in their youth. Many of the children are children of the pioneers, and the numbers grow greater with the generations.

Anshe Chesed has provided American Jewry with a large number of lay leaders, who gained their knowledge and inspiration within the confines of the temple and its religious school. Former members and confirmands are to be found in cities all over America in positions of secular and civic leadership.

A substantial number of rabbis have gone into reform Judaism from this temple family. Among them are: the late Rabbi Eugene Hibshman; Rabbi Newton Friedman, Macon, Ga.; Rabbi Bernard Rosenberg, Stockton, Calif.; Rabbi Jerome Folkman, Columbus, Ohio; the late Rabbi Bernard Dorfman, Dr. Alan S. Green, Temple Emanu-El, Cleveland; Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn, Boston, Mass.; Rabbi Elmer Berger, New York City; Rabbi Sanford Rosen, San Mateo, Calif.; Rabbi Benno Wallach, North Miami, Fla.; Rabbi Robert Raab, McKeesport, Pa.; Rabbi Bal-four Brickner, Washington, D.C.; Rabbi Samuel Soskin, Brooklyn, N.Y., and Bernard Starkoff and Jack Skirball who left the ministry for private business.

RABBIS WHO HAVE SERVED THE ANSHE CHESED CONGREGATION

According to available records the following served as rabbis prior to 1876: Rabbi Isaac Hoffman, Rabbi S. L. Stern, Rabbi P. Frould, Rabbi I. Kalish, Rabbi Wetterhahn, Rabbi Hertzman, Rabbi Field, Rabbi Liebman, Rabbi Gustavus M. Cohen, Rabbi Nathan, Rabbi M. Tinter; 1876-1906, Rabbi Michaelis Machol; 1906-25, Rabbi Louis Wolsey; 1925-58, Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner; 1958 to present Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld.

CONGREGATIONAL PRESIDENTS

Frederick Goldsmith, 1846-49; Simon Newmark, 1849-55, 1859-60, 1865-68, 1876-78; Aaron Halle, 1855-57; Abraham Strauss, 1857-58; Simon Thorman, 1858-59; S. Goodhart, 1861-62; Jacob Rohrheimer, 1862-63; Abraham Schwarz, 1863-64; Moses Loeser, 1864-65; M. J. Moses, 1870-72; Nathan New, 1872-75; Isaac Reinthal, 1879-81, 1890-94; Simon Skall, 1882-90; Moses Halle, 1894-95; Isaac Levy, 1896-1912; Simon Fishel, 1913-16; Nathan Loeser, 1916-21; David S. Kohn, 1921-30; Irwin S. Loeser, 1930-35; Myron A. Cohen, 1935-38; James M. Miller, 1939-42; Judge Maurice Bernon, 1943-47; Otto J. Zinner, 1948-49; J. W. Grodin, 1949-50; Emil M. Elder, 1951-53; Alfred I. Soltz, 1954-57.

The presidents of the congregation since 1957 have been: Bertram W. Amsler, 1958-59; Bernard J. Kaufman, 1960-62; Irving J. Ringel, 1963-64; Edward Ginsberg, 1965 to the present.

IMPORT-EXPORT STATISTICS OFF THE BEAM—REVISION IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for years our export surplus in merchandise has been a source of gratification and comfort, offsetting the shadow cast on our economy by the balance-of-payments deficit. During the past decade, we have become accustomed to reading optimistic reports about our merchandise export balance. During the past 5 years this surplus has not fallen below \$4.5 billion

and in 1964 leaped to nearly \$7 billion: a thick cushion—we thought.

It was comforting to believe that our merchandise exports did so much to offset our foreign expenditures in the form of foreign aid, both economic and military, tourist outlays, investment outflow, and similar drains on our dollars. But for this surplus the bleeding away of our gold from Fort Knox would have been even more serious than it has been; and we could have been hard put to uphold our continuing outlays for foreign aid in the form of heavy shipments of goods paid for from our Treasury; military assistance, extension of soft loans to the developing countries, and other distribution of the goods and dollars produced by our economy.

It comes now as a blow to learn that these surpluses were not all that they were held out to be. Some of what was regarded as sinew turned out to be blubber. The result was a serious shrinkage of the supposed trade surplus and damage to our competitive position in world markets.

Through the years we had been compounding an error in surplus computations. In part, on that error we built a trade policy and it has influenced foreign policy positions. We have drawn false conclusions from illusory computations. One was that our exports were a solid bulwark against a worsening balance-of-payments problem. We needed only to stimulate exports, and the balance-of-payments specter would largely vanish with its disquieting threat.

The other fallacy lay in the easy conclusion that since we enjoyed such an export surplus we must be highly competitive in the markets of the farflung corners of the earth. How could we ring up such comfortable balances on our export cash registers if we were not top-notch competitors, whether it be in Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania, or elsewhere? Surely the test of the pudding was in the eating of it.

Unfortunately the trade balances were not what they appeared to be. They were overstated. I do not say that they were manipulated. Nevertheless they conveyed an impression not borne out by the facts. The value of our imports has been understated by nearly one-fifth through the use of foreign cost as the basis of evaluation. This is the same as computing the cost of an automobile at its f.o.b. price, Detroit, no matter whether the purchaser lives in Detroit, Dallas, New York, or San Francisco. Obviously the freight charges are not included in such a basis of evaluation, but they must be paid by the buyer. Our imports from Japan, for instance, are recorded on the basis of the cost at Yokohama or other port, without including freight and insurance charges incident to landing them in this country, exclusive of duty. Competent calculations have shown that during the past 3 years this manner of recording our imports from Japan produced an average under-evaluation of some 23 percent. The same method is applied to imports from all other countries. With respect to imports from the United Kingdom, the

February 8, 1966

Korea—the only other nations with combat troops in South Vietnam—to join your strategy discussions with Premier Ky. The suggestion was made earlier today by House Minority Leader Ford.

This would demonstrate our desire for help at the strategy table as well as on the battlefield, and perhaps would encourage other nations to send combat troops.

Recently Secretaries Rusk and McNamara pleaded vainly before the NATO Council in Paris for aid in Vietnam.

The American people are distressed because we are receiving so little help, and they are worried about lies ahead if we try to police the world virtually alone.

We can more reasonably expect help in carrying out war plans if we call our allies into council when plans are made. Counseling with Australia and South Korea at this time would be a step in the right direction, and hopefully lead to broadened free-world aid in the defense of South Vietnam.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Member of Congress.

Today I received the following reply:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 7, 1966.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: On behalf of the President, in response to your telegram to him dated February 5, I would like to express his appreciation for your highly constructive proposal for broadening the Honolulu Conference to include the leaders of South Korea and Australia.

I have been asked to advise you that close consultations with these and other of our allies in South Vietnam took place shortly before the Honolulu meeting was called, and followthrough consultations will be undertaken when that conference adjourns. The President determined, for separate reasons, that the participants in Honolulu should be as announced. This in no way diminishes the common purpose and collective sacrifices of our allies, or the high importance that the President gives to continuous consultations with them. They will continue to participate in both strategic and tactical decisions, and there are likely to be other meetings where they will be present.

May I assure you that the President's clear purpose remains to broaden free world assistance to our common purpose in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

DON ROPE.

Here is the text of the letter I sent today to the President:

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I appreciate very much the prompt response to my telegram. It was gratifying to learn that close consultations with South Korea and Australia occurred prior to the Honolulu meeting and further, that followthrough consultations will occur when the Conference adjourns.

It was encouraging to have your assurance that these two nations—the only ones presently aiding our effort in South Vietnam with combat troops—"will continue to participate in both strategic and tactical decisions, and there are likely to be other meetings where they will be present."

Although the separate reasons for not inviting South Korea and Australia to Honolulu may have seemed compelling, their absence seems to me most unfortunate.

This was a splendid opportunity to demonstrate the teamwork character of the defense of South Vietnam. As these allies are actually participating in strategic and tactical decisions, why not tell the world? The Honolulu Conference quite properly drew tremendous worldwide publicity and today's newspaper carried the headline "Allies Pledge Fight Till Victory."

How much better it would have been if the allies so mentioned had included all the allies whose boys are fighting in the jungles with our own. The presence and participation of

Australia and South Korea would surely have built sentiment in support of the war effort in those countries, and equally important, it would have demonstrated that the United States welcomes and appreciates help at the strategy table as well as in combat.

As it was, the Conference structure gave the appearance that the only nations whose combat contributions deserved recognition were the United States and South Vietnam.

This is bound to deepen the concern of many Americans who already regard the conflict as a U.S. war, and of others who see the urgent need for broadened allied support. It is not too late to repair the damage.

I respectfully suggest that you arrange at the earliest possible date a conference which will let the world know that this is and must increasingly become a team effort.

I further suggest you invite the chiefs of state of Australia and South Korea and perhaps others like the Philippines from whom we seek increased support.

Such a conference might well lead to the support which Secretary of State Rusk recently sought from our NATO allies.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

EDUCATION ON COMMUNISM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a former President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in an address to the American Bar Association, stated:

Our people, and especially our children, should be taught the facts about communism. Only thus will they be able to discriminate between truth and falsehood.

In the light of events of the past few years, few can deny that the advice of former President Eisenhower regarding responsible education on communism assumes a greater urgency day by day, especially in the ranks of American youth, our leaders of tomorrow.

Jerry Greene of the New York Daily News in his column of February 2 provided us with additional justification for arming our students with the weapon of knowledge to identify and resist present Communist plans to entrap American youth.

To show that the danger of Communist designs, like the symptoms of cancer, increase from day to day, I ask that Mr. Greene's column, along with the February message of Director Hoover in the FBI Law Enforcement bulletin to which Mr. Greene refers, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 2, 1966]

CAPITAL STUFF
(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—For a few short hours today, the crusty slush, lingering from the weekend blizzard, proved a blessing here. There were no pickets at the White House.

The occasion was made to order for demonstrations, this day after President Johnson ordered air strikes resumed in North Vietnam. Much of the time, rain or snow, the pickets are on hand along Pennsylvania Avenue, proclaiming objections to anything. The Government's Vietnam policy has been the pet target for a year.

The pickets range in appearance from fancy to frowzy. But almost without ex-

ception, they all wear that grim, humorless, vapid face that labels them members of the new left.

In pinko jargon, the new left is composed of intellectuals with a cause, based in or around the college campus.

In FBI eyes, the new left is a happy recruiting ground where the Communist expect to enroll thousands of new members in 1966.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover laid down a strong warning in the February issue of the Law Enforcement Bulletin of what the Nation and its police officers can expect from the Commies and the new left in the months ahead. It adds up to one word: trouble.

Hoover noted that today's college student is being "subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy." He said this student faces turbulence "built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values and disrespect for law and order."

This conspiracy, this turbulence Hoover said, is the movement "commonly referred to as the new left."

The Commies do not consider the college flareups insignificant, Hoover reports. And high on the agenda at the Communist Party's planned national convention this spring will be a plan to capture the new lookers as full-fledged, dedicated members.

TOP COURT LETS REDS HARMONIZE ON DISCORD

The Communists have been plunging ahead boldly with plans for expansion and disturbance since the Supreme Court's November ruling, which knocked the guts out of the Internal Security Act. That decision killed the requirement that individual Communists had to register as party members.

For months the domestic Reds had been using the Viet war as a vehicle for promoting turmoil; now they have emerged in triumphant voice to sing of discord and strife. National Secretary Robert Thompson died and was cremated in October; by January the Reds were ready with a blatant attempt to profane Arlington National Cemetery with a big anti-Viet war meeting disguised as a hero's funeral.

A man widely accredited as a top spokesman for the new left, Staughton Lynd, went to Hanoi a month ago as a self-anointed peace emissary. This young Yale assistant professor and perpetual bleeding heart got a lot of headline and video tape mileage out of the expedition—a pure, illegal, pinko meddling job.

THE MAN TO WATCH GOES UNNOTICED

Oddly enough, beyond barebones identification, little attention was given to one of Lynd's two companions—Herbert Aptheker, 50, variously described as a chief theoretician of the U.S. Communist Party or as its top ideologue.

Aptheker was the man to watch on that Hanoi junket, and the odds are heavy that Ho Chi Minh and his pals actively in charge of the war gave him a lot more time than they had for the younger, and louder, spokesman of the so-called peace trio.

Aptheker has long been high in the councils of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as this thing calls itself. An editor, ghostwriter, and top party man since 1939, Aptheker was a character witness—a defamation of the term—for the party before the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1956.

The presence of Aptheker was a tipoff, if ever one was needed. These pseudo-intellectuals who have wrapped themselves in the innocent guise of new left may have a few fresh faces out in front, plain dupes or pure converts, but close behind are the same old bitter faces.

There isn't much new about Aptheker or his associates in pushing for peace on Communist terms. You've heard their names before. There's Gus Hall, the general secretary, and Danny Rubin, the national organizational secretary. There's Gilbert Green,